



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



141. } 156.





VINDICIÆ
FIDEI,
OR
A T R E A T I S E
of Iustification by Faith,
*wherein the truth of that point
is fully cleared, and vindicated
from the cavills of it's
Adversaries*

Deliuered at Magdalen Hall
in Oxford; By W I L L I A M
P E M B L E, M^r of Arts.

The Second Edition.

— And be found in him not having mine owne righ-
eonsesse, which is of the Law, but that which is through
the faute of Christ, the righcuousesse which is of God
by Faute. PHILIP. 3. 9

AT OXFORD,
Printed by JOHN LICHFIELD,
Printer to the Universitie, for
EDWARD FORREST. 1629

141. j 156.





TO
**THE RIGHT
VVORSHIPFVLL**

M^r D^r WILKINSON Princi-

pall of Magdalen Hall: The Masters,
Bachelours, and other Students of
that flourishing Society.



SIRS,



Vstome hath made De-
dication of Books almost
as common, as Printing
of them: and Wildome
directs there to dedicate,
where we owe either re-
spect, or thankes: this
worke therefore is Yours

by right, the Author thereof (who is now with
¶ 2, God)

The Epistle Dedicatory.

God) vndertaking it at your request , and performing it amongst you for your good , so that now to bestow it vpon you is not a gift , but retribution : and I hope , it will both stirre you vp to be carefull to continue fit men to stand vp in his place , and remaine to his successours as a pat-terne of imitation , if it bee too high for amulati-
on . To commend this Author to you , were to bring Owles to Athens , and for me to commend the Worke , would not adde much worth to it : I knowe nothing can diſparage it , vnlesſe it be a naked Margent : but you and all that will bee pleased to take notice of his yeares , and great abi-lities in all humane learning , will confesse hee could not haue time to read many Fathers , and so that defect may be easily pardoned . For hee had fully finished ſixelusters of yeares , yet had hee thoroughly traced the circle of the Arts , and attained to an eminencie , not onely in thofe ordi-nary Sciences , wherein all Schollers haue ſome ſmattering , but euen in thofe ſublimē ſpecula-tions of which all are not capable , few ſearch after : For hee was expert in the *Mathematickes* both mixt , and pure : his ſkill in Histories was alſo praife-worthie : ſome time he ſpent /and not without

The Epistle Dedicatory.

without successe) in trauailing to learne forraigne languages, and much trauaile in the study of our home taught tonges, that he had worth to haue beene Professor either in *Greeke* or *Hebrewe*: all which endowments , as they might afterwards haue enabled him to read with much profit , so could they not chuse but preuent younger yeares from reading at all the Ancient Fathers : so that it was not want, but abundance of learning that tooke vphis time, and preven-
ted his Margent , and therefore I hope shall not disparage this worke. The first weapon young Fencers learne to vse is single Sword, when they are Masters of that, they enlarge their skill ; our Author was but young , let it not prejudice him, that he first vses onely the sword of the Spi-
rit, the word of God ; especially sith that is so dextrously weeldeed , that by it alone hee hath deadly wounded the Romish *Leviathan* : There-
fore (as in my knowledge) these Lectures were heard with much applause , so doe I perswade my selfe, they will bee read with great approba-
tion, and occasion the publishing of other Lec-
tures, and priuate labours, wherein he tooke no
lesse paines, nor deserued lesse praise, then in his

The Epistle Dedicatory.

publique endeaours. So hoping that you will accept this small paines of mine, I take my leaue and rest

*From Tewkeisbury this
9 of July 1629.*

*Tours: willing to doe you greater,
though not more acceptable
service,*

JOHN GEREE.

To the Christian Reader.



Entle Reader, this Treatise was neither finisched nor polished by the Author: Hee left it with mee when he died, to bee dealt with as cause should require, upon perusal, I found it fit for the time, so full of life, so sound and cleere in prooofe, that in my conceit it will doe much good: & here thou hast it, as he left it. The argument is of all, in difference betwixt vs & Papists, the chiefest, no controuersie more disputed, and lesse agreed upon then this. Christ & his blood is the maine cause of our spirituall peace; Papists and others diuide with him, and take something to themselves: the spirituall pride that is in the heart of man, would faine haue a finger in the worke of saluation, of other controuersies betwixt vs and the other party: some be for the Popes Kitchin, some for the Popes crowne, but this of our iustification, toucheth the life of grace to the quick, breeds more in our flesh then any, and those sicknesses are most dangerous, that come from within. It is a fundamentall case, wherein to faile takes away the essence of a christian: wherefore fit there is now such need to haue the world confirmed in this truth of God, I thought good to send this booke abroad, wherein this is put out of question to any man of a single eye; that we are not iustified by any thing wee can doe or suffer.

Many write booke, and confute them selues when they haue done; but this our Author what he wrote, he believed; for being to die, hee confirmed this Truth, in a discourse full of life and power, and professed to take his last vp on it, that it was the very truth of God. Wee reade that some learned Papists, when they are to gine vp the ghost, disclaime their

To the Christian Reader.

their owne merits, and w^ould faine finde all in Christ alone: but this our Author did it before sandry, with that life, and feeling, and cleare apprehension of the loue of God in his son, that such as heard him, and loued him well and long, could not well tell, whether they shoulde weepe, or reioice; weepe to see a friend die, reioice to see him die so. Good Reader, learne this holy instruction out of this booke: that wee are not to bee found in our owne righteousnesse at all and beleue it; thou shalt haue as he had, peace passing all understandind, in life, and in death, for being iustified by faith (not by workes) wee haue peace with God saith Saint Paul. If any ingenuous learned Papist would undertake to answere this booke, me thinkes I might prophecy that as Vergerius (Bishop of Capo d'Istria, & Nuncio to Clement the seventh, and Paul the third) reading Luther, to answere Luther, was conuerted, and had his soule saued. And as Pighius, though of a peevish spirit enough, yet reading Caluin, to confute Caluin, was in the very doctrine of Iustification confuted himselfe, and wrought with vs. So I say, would a modest Papist read this booke to reply unto it, he could not but see the truth, and yeeld unto it. For though many haue done excellently in this argument, yet to speake my opinion freely, at least for perspicuity, this surpasseth them all. Farewell.

Thine in Christ, Rich. Capel.



A TREATISE OF IVSTIFICATION

CAP. I.

The explication of these termes. First, Justice, or Rightcousnesse. Secondly, Iustification.

Auing by Gods assistance dispatched *Sect. I. c. I.* two of those generall points at first proposed(touching the Antecedents and Nature of true Faith)we are now by the same helpe to goe forward to the third generall head; namely, concerning the Consequents of Faith, which were two, our *Iustification* in regard of God, and our *Obedience* in regard of our selues. The former will shew vs how to iudge of the dignity and excellent worth of Faith; being so farre honoured in Gods gratiouse acceptance, as to be made the blessed instrument of our spirituall peace and comfort flowing from our Iustification. The latter will direct vs how to make triall of the truth of our faith in the discovery of that vnseparabile Vnion which there is betweene believng and obeyng.

A

Lxx

Let vs begin with the former , our *Iustification*, the doctrine whereof I shall endeauour to deliuer vnto you , as brieflye and plainely , as so large and difficult a subiect will giue leaue. Wherein because the opening of the word will giue vs some light for the vnderstanding of the matter : wee are in the first place to see what is meant by these words , *Iustification*, and *Iustice*, or *Righteousnesse*.

Iustice, therefore, or *Righteousnesse* (that I meane which is created, for of vncreated *Righteousnesse*, wee haue not to speake) is nothing but a perfect conformity and agreement with the Law of God. For Gods will being originally , essentially , and infinitely righteous; must needs bee the patterne and rule of all derivative & finite righteousness. Now this righteousness (though but one in its substance , neuerthelesse) admits a double consideration, being called either,

i *Legall* and of *Workes*, which stands in that conformity vnto Gods law, which is inherent within our selues, when in our owne persons and workes wee posseſſe and practise that righteousness which is required of the Law.

This *Legall Iustice* is also double.

i Of *Obedience*, when all such things are done ; as the Law commandeth; & left vndone which it forbids. He that doth so is a iust man.

2 Of *Punishment* or *Satisfaction*, when the breach of the Law is satisfied by enduring the vtmost of such penalties, as the rigour of the Law required. For not only he who doth what the Law commandeth: but euē he also that suffereth all such punishments, as the Law-giuere in justice can inflict for the breach of the Law , is to bee accounted a iust man, and reckoned after such satisfaction made , as no transgressor of the Law. The reason of this is plaine from the nature of penall Lawes. For

For ſiſt, where the penaſy is ſuffered, there the will of the Law-giuer is ſatisfied; for as much as his will was, either that the law ſhould be obſerved, or the penaſy under-gone. If therefore he, to whome the law is giuen, doe either he ſatisfies the will of the Law-giuer. Had his will beeſe abſolute, ſo that nothing elſe could haue contein'd him, but only obedience: then it had beeſe a vaine thing to haue preſcribed a determinate penaſy. But when as a penaſy is limited in case of diſobedience, 'tis maniſt that though the intent of the Law-giuer was in the firſt place for obedience; yet in the next place it ſhould ſuffice, if there were ſatisfaction by bearing of the penaſy.

Secondly, the good and benefit of the Law-giuer is hereby alſo ſatisfied. For it is to bee ſuppoſed in all penaſy lawes, that the penaſy limited is every way proportionable and equivalent vnto that good, which might accrew by the obſervation of the law. Else were the wiſdome of the Law-maker iuſtly to be taxed, as giuing an apparant encouragement to offendres; when they ſhould ſee the penaſy, not to be ſo much hurtful to them; as their diſobedience were gaineſfull. Hee therefore that ſuffers the penaſy is afterward to bee reckoned as if hee had kept the Law: because by his ſuffering, he hath aduanced the Law-giuers honour, or benefit, as muſh as he could by his obeying.

2 *Evangelicall, and of Faith,* which is ſuch a confor-mity to Gods Law as is not inherent in our own persons; but being in another is imputed vnto vs & reckoned ours. The righteouſneſſe of the Law, and of the Gospell, are not two feſveral kinds of righteouſneſſe; but the fame in regard of the matter and ſubſtance thereof: only they differ in the ſubieet and manner of application. The righteouſneſſe of works is that holineſſe and obedience which is inherent in our

owne persons and performed by our selues: the righteousness of Faith is the same holinesse and obedience inherent in the person of Christ and performed by him; but imbraced by our faith, and accepted by God, as done in our stead, and for our benefit.

These are the divers acceptions of this word Justice or Righteousnesse; so farre as it concernes the point in hand.

In the next place we are to enquire of this word *Infusification*, which being nothing but the making of a person iust or righteous, may be taken in a double sense. For a person is made iust either by *Infusion*, or *Apologie*. We will take it in these termes for want of better.

I 1 *Infusification* by *Infusion*, is then, when the habituall quality of Righteousnesse and Holinessse is wrought in any person by any meanes whatsoeuer; whether it bee created and infused into him by the worke of another; or obtained by his owne art and industry. Thus Adam was made iust. *Eccles. 7.29* God having giuen vnto him in his creation the inherent qualities of Justice and holinessse. Thus also the rege-nereate are made iust, in as much as by the holy Ghost, they are sanctified through the reall infusion of grace into their soules; in the which they increase also more and more, by the vse of exercise and all good meanes.

2 *Infusification*, by *Apologie* is, when a person accused as an offender is judicially or otherwise acquitted and declared to be innocent of the fault: and so free from the punishment. When the innocency of a party accused is thus pleaded & declared, he is thereby said to be iustified, or made iust: according as, on the contrary by accusation and condemnation, a party is said to be made vnjust. As 'tis plaine by that of *Isaiah 5.23*. [They iustifie the wicked for a reward: and take away the righteousness of the righteous from him] that is

is, they condemne the righteous, which is a making of them vnrighteous in the sight and estimation of men. So in 1.10h.
5.10. [He that believeth not God, hath made him a lie] because vnbelieuers doe in their hearts call Gods truth into question: and accuse him to be false of his word. So againe, Psal.109.7. [when he is indged, let him bee condemned.] יתְּבִא נָגֵד. Let him goe out a wicked person. For so his condemnation makes him (that is) declares him to be. But here further it must be obserued, that this *Iustification* of a person, by pleading to, and absolution in iudgement, is of two sorts; according as the persons to bee iustified, are likewise of two severall conditions..

1 Some are truely and inherently iust, being no Transgressors of the law; either at all; or not in that whereof they are accused. In this case if any crime, or suspition of crime, be laid to their charge; they are iustified; either by a plaine deniall of the fact, alleging that the fault whereof they are accused, was never by them committed; or by denying the cuill of the fact, alleging that in so doing they haue done well, because they haue done what the law commanded; & that's their warrant. Thus *Samuel* iustifies his gouernment against all surmisse of fraudulent and wrongfull dealing, that the people might imagine by him, in *1.Sam.12.3.* &c. Thus *David* cleares himselfe before God, from that crime of conspiracie against *Saul* his Master, and seeking of the kingdome (which *Cush* and other Couriers accused him of) professing his innocency; and desiring God to iudge him according to his righteousnesse and integrity in that behalfe: as it is *Psal.7.3.4.8.* There need not other instances in so plain a matter. Those that are iustified by this meanes are iustified by that Righteousnesse which is of the *Law* and of *workes*. By which plea though man may bee iustified before man,

yet in the sight of God no flesh liuing shall be iustified. As hereafter we shall see.

2 Some are not truly righteous in themselves : but are in their own persons transgressors of the law. These (when they are accused) haue no other meanes whereby they may be iustified, but by confessing the crime , and pleading *satisfaction*: that for their transgression against the Law , and offence thereby against the Law-giver, they haue fully satisfied by doing or suffering some such thing , as by way of iust penalty hath beene required of them. Now hee that can plead such a full and perfect satisfaction, ought therefore to be accounted innocent , and free from all desert of further punishment/for tis supposed he hath endured the vtmost of evill the Law could inflict:) and so he is to bee esteemeed of, as if he had not at all violated the law. For plenary satisfaction for a fault, and the *non-Commission* of such a fault , are of equall justice: & de serue alike iustification. In which point, it must bee noted , that if the party offended doe pardon without any satisfaction taken , there the offender is not iustified at all. And againe if the offence bee such, as there can be no satisfaction made: then it is vtterly impossible that the offender should euer bee iustified. Now this satisfaction which an offender may plead for his iustification , is threefold.

1 That which is made by himselfe in his owne person. He that can plead this kind of satisfaction, is iustified *Legally* by his own righteoufnesse and merits.

2 That which is made by another for him ; When another by consent and approbation of the party offended , interposeth himselfe as *surety* for the party delinquent , in his stead and name to make that *satisfaction* , which is required of the party himselfe . Whether this be done by doing or suffering

suffering the same things which the delinquent should haue done or suffered ; or some other things but of equivalent worth and dignity. Hee that pleads this kinde of satisfaction, is iustified Evangelically by grace, through the righteousness of another imputed to him, and accepted for as his.

3 That which is made partly by himselfe and partly by another. Which kinde of satisfaction may haue place betweene Man and Man: but betweene God and man it hath none at all. Neither by this, nor by that first kinde of *satisfaction* which is done in our owne persons, can any man be iustified in the sight of God, but only by the second sort, that *satisfaction* which is made by another for vs. As wee shall see afterwards.

CHAP. II.

*In what sense the word Iustification ought to be taken
in the present controuerse, and of the diffe-
rence betweene vs and our Ad-
uersaries therein.*

 Aving thus distinguished of these words, it followeth that in the first place, we enquire in which of the fore-named senses wee are to take this word *Iustification*. The difference betweene vs and our aduersaries of the Romish Church, is in this point very great and irreconcileable. They affirme that *Iustification* is to be taken in the first acceptation, for making of a Man iust by infusion of Reall Holinesse into him. So that with them to iustifie, beares the same sense as to *purifie* or *sanctifie*: that is of a person vncleane, vnholy, vniust, to make him formally or inherently *Pure*, *Holy*, and *Iust*, by working in him the inherent qualities of *Purity*, *Sanctity* and *Righteousnesse*. We

We on the contrary teach according to the Scriptures; That *Iustification*, is to be taken in the seconde acceptation, for the pleading of a persons innocency called into question: whereby he is iudicallly absoluued and freed from fault and punishment. So that with vs to justifie a person is in iudicall proceeding to acquit him of the crime whereof he is accused , and to declare him free from desert of punishment. Whether of vs twaine be in the right is very materiall to be determined of, considering that all ensuing disputation touching the *Iustification* of a sinner is to be framed vpon one of these grounds, rightly taken ; and an error here is like a thred misplaced at first, that runs awry afterward through the whole peece. Our adversaries plead for their assertion : the *Etymology* of the word *iustificare* is *iustum facere*, in that sense (say they) as *Purificare*, *Mortificare*, *Vivificare*, & many the like signifie to make pure, to make dead or aliue , by the reall induction of such and such Qualities.

Againe, they alleadge *Scriptures*; as namely *Dan.* 12.3. [They that turne many to righteounesse (Heb. that iustifie many,) shall shine as the Starres for euer] *Apoc.* 22.11. [Hee that is righteous (iustificetur) Let him be righteous still.] *Tit.* 3.7. [He hath saued vs by the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the holy Ghost,---That being iustified by his grace we shalbe made Heires according to the hope of eternall life.] Againe, *I.Cor.* 6.11. [And such were some of you: but yee are washed, but yee are sanctified, but yee are iustified, in the name of the Lord Iesus, and by the Spirit of our God.] Out of these with some other places (but such as haue scarce any shew of good prooфе) they would faine conclude , that by *Iustification* nothing else is meant, but the *Infusion* of the *Habite of Justice* into him , that was before sinfull and vniust.

Rom. 8.30.
Heb. 9.

Hereto

Hereto we answer. 1. First for the *Etymology* that the signification of words is to be ruled, not by *Etymologies*: but by the common vse:

Quem penes arbitrium est & vis & norma loquendi
 as the Poet truely defines. Now its a thing notorious that in the custome of all languages, this word *Iustificare* imports nothing but the declaration of the Innocency of a person; and lawfulness of any fact: against such accusations as implead either of vniustice or wrong. I will iustifie such a man or such a matter (say we in English) and what Englishman understandes thereby any thing but this. I will make it appearre such a man is honest, such a fact lawfull, however questioned to the contrary. In other languages my skill serues me not , nor is it needfull to trouble you with instances. Those that haue written of this subiect of every Nation, witnessesse every one for their owne language. And further this word *Iustificare* being of a latter stamp , vnknowne to such Latine Authors, as are of ancient and purer Language, fitted by Ecclesiasticall writers to expresse the meaning of those two words of the Originall קִרְבָּן and מִתְּמֻנָּה ; it is apparent the Copy must follow the Originall , and the Latine word beare the same sense as the Hebrew & Greeke words doe. And that this is that legall sense which we haue spoken of is a point so manifest throughout the whole Bible : that nothing but impudency can deny it. As we shall present-
 ly perceiue.

For in the next place. 2 As to the Scriptures which they alleadge for prooef of their interpretation of the word: We answeare: That of a multitude of places of Scripture, wherein the word *Iustifie* is vsed, our aduersaries may truely picke out one,or two,or three that seeme to fauour their assertion of *Infusion of habituall Justice*: yet haue they gained little thereby.

thereby. For where tenne or more may be alleadged against one in which the contrary signification is vfed , reason tells vs, that an Article and Doctrine of religion ought to bee framed out of the signification of words and phrases, which is vſuall, ordinary, and regular ; and not out of that which sometimes comes in by way of particular exception. Migh he not be iudged destitute of sense and modesty , that would quarrell at the signification of the word *Ecclesia* , that in the new Testament it is not taken for the company and assembly of the faſthfull,because in a place or two (as *Act. 19*) it is taken for any ordinary ciuill meeting of people together? Wherefore we may grant them(נָצִיר in that of *Dan. 12.*) and (διάκονος in *Apoc. 22.*) is to be made iuft, *formaliter*, by *infation* of inherent holinesſe in a ſinner. For ſo Ministers may be ſaid to *infifie* many(as it is in *Daniel*) viz. by their Miniftary turne many to righteouſneſſe , directing them to the meaneſes of Holineſſe, and as Gods Instruments , working in them the graces of conuerſion and regeneration. And ſo he

² **Lib. I. de Iuf. cap. I.*

I
See Luke 18.
14. This man went downe to his houſe iuftified rather then the other. His praier was for pardon. God be mercifull,&c,
For he went home iuftified (i.e.) pardoned and absolued rather then the Pharisee.

We anſwere , that of all thoſe other places alledged by Bell. and Beccanus,* there is not any one that doth neceſſarily enforce ſuch a meaning of the word ; as he and his fellowes ſtand for. These aboue the reſt haue moſt appearance, namely, *1. Cor. 6. & Tit. 3. Rom. 8.30.* where *Instiftation* is, ſay they confounded as one and the lame with *Sanctification* & *Re-generation*. Wherenvnto I anſwere that they doe ill to confound thoſe things that the Apostle hath diſtinguiſhed very plainly.

plainely, He tells the *Corinthians*, that the vnrigheteous shall not inherit the kingdome of God, and that themſelues had beene ſuch, euen of the moft notorious ranck: but now they were washed, ſanctified and *Inuſtified*. By three words the *Apoſtle* expreſſeth the change of their former condition. One *Metaphorickall* (*yee are washed*) The meaning whereof he declareth in two proper words following. [*yee are Sanctified*] thats one degree of washing or cleaſing from the corruption of *Nature* (in part) by the [*Spirit of our God*] of whom is the gift of inherent grace. And [*yee are iuſtified*] thats another ſort of washing, from the guilt of *Sinne* (in the whole) [*in the name of the Lord Iefus*] that is, by the Righteouſneſſe and *Merits of Iefus Christ*. Nothing can bee more perſpicuous and elegant. That place to *Tit. Chap. 3.* is alſo as plaine. *God (faith the Apoſtle)* ſpeaking of the Heires and ſonnes of *God in Christ* (hath ſaued vs [*not by any workes of ours: but by his owne mercy, ver. 5.*]) This ſalvation is ſet forth to vs in the Meanes and in the End. The meaneſes are two, *Regeneration* and *Inuſtification*. [*Hee hath ſaued vs by the washing of Regeneration, and renewing of the holy Ghost*] This is the firſt meaneſe (*viz.*) Regeneration ex- preſſed, 1. by its properties or parts, 1. *Washing* or doing a- way of the filthy qualitieſ of our corrupted nature. 2. *Re- newing*, the Inveſting of it with new qualitieſ of Graces and Holineſſe.

2 By the cauſe efficient the *Holy Ghost* [whom he hath ſhed on vs abundantly] or richly, following the *Metaphore*, comparing the *Holy Ghost* in this operation to water pow- red out. 2 The Meritorious cauſe of it [*Through Iefus Christ our Saviour*] who hath pro cured the ſending downe of the *[Holy Ghost]* into the hearts of the elect, ver. 6. This is one ſtep to heauen, our regeneration, but it is imperfect & can-

ferred, ady-
tiam Regene-
racionis.

dowes of it) ascribes vnto it what could not bee effected by those, (*viz.*) eternall Redemption [*ver. 12.*] purging of the conscience from dead workes [*verse 12.*] the putting away of sinne, [*verse 26.*] The sanctification of the Elect, [*Chap. 10. 7. 10.*] made *Heires* according to the hope of eternall life. In neither then of those places is our sanctification confounded with our iustification: but both distinctly declared, as two severall parts of grace and meanes of the accomplishment of our eternall happinesse. 'Tis scarce worth the labour to examine those other Scriptures produced by our Aduersaries, whereof some part doe directly crosse, & the rest doe but only in appearance confirme their assertion. In generall therefore for them, thus much we confidently affirme, that let the Concordance be studied, and all those places examined wherein either [*דָצְרִיךְ*] is vied in the old or [*δικαιοῦται*] in the new Testament: there will not one be found, no not one, in which those words carry any other meaning, then that which we stand for (*viz.*) the clearing of a parties innocence questioned as faulty, and blameworthy. Take a tast of some places.

Rom. 6.7.
[*διδασκαλεῖται*]
significat libe-
ratur: sed seipius
loci differunt
indicant.

I *Iustification* is sometimes applied to God, when Man iustifies God. As *Psalms. 51. 4. Rom. 3. 4.* [*That thou mightest be iustified* [*δικαιοῦται*] *in thy saying, & mightest overcomē when thou art iudged*] *Mat. 11. 19.* [*And wisdome is iustified* [*δικαιοῦται*] *of her children*] *Luke 7. 35. Luke 7. 29.* [*And the Publicans iustified* [*δικαιοῦνται*] *God, being baptizēt with the baptisme of Iohn.*] Can there be any other meaning of iustification here: but this onely? That God is then iustified, when his workes, his wisdome, his sacred ordinances, being accused by prophane men, as vntreue, vnequall, vniust, and foolish, are by the Godly acknowledged, or an other meanes evidently cleared vnto all men,

to

to be full of all truth, equity, wiſdome, and holinesſe?

2 Man and that

1 Before man in things betweene man and man. When man iuſtifies man, Deut. 25.1. [If there be a controverſie betweene men, and they come unto iudgement, that the Judge may iudge them, then they ſhall iuſtifie [דָּצְרִיקָה] the righteous and condemne the wicked] Isaiah, 5.23. [Wo to them which iuſtifie the wicked for a reward, and take away the righteouſneſſe of the righteous from him] Proverb. 17. 15. [He that iuſtifieth the wicked, & condemneth the iuft, euen they both are an abomination to the Lord.] 2.Sam. 15.4. [Oh that I were made Judge in the land, that every man that hath any ſuit or cauſe, might come to me, and I would doe him iuſtice. [וְהַדְצֵרִיקָהִיר] In theſe and many the like places, to iuſtifie is in iudiciale proceeding to abſolute a party from fault and blame: whether it bee rightfull or wrongfullly done. Ezek. 16.52. [Be thou confounded and beare thy ſhame, in that thou haſt iuſtified thy ſiſters] ſpeakes God vnto Jeruſalem; in comparison of whose abomination the ſinnes of Sodome and Samaria were scarce to be accounted any faults. They were Saints to her. Of the Phariſees Christ ſpeakes, Luke 16.15. [Tee are they that iuſtifie your ſelues before men: but God knoweth your hearts.] That is, You ſtand vpon the defence and oſtentation of outward Holineſſe, and deeming it ſufficient to make it appeare before men you are holy: without regard of acquitting the ſyncerity of your hearts before God.

2 Before God, where God iuſtifies man Exod. 23.7. [The innocent and the righteous ſlay thou not, for I will not iuſtifie the wicked.] by esteeming him as ianocent, & letting him goe from punishment. Isaiah 50.8. [He is neere that iuſtifieth me, who will contend with me?] ſaith the Prophet

in the person of Christ, signifying God would make it appear that he was blamelesse, for the reiection of his people the Jewes who perished for their owne and not his fault.

Rom. 5. 18. [As by the offence of one judgement came on all men to condemnation: So by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to the Iustification of life] Rom. 8. 33. 34. [who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It is God that iustifies; who shall condemne? 1. Cor. 4. 4. [I knowe nothing by my selfe: yet in this am I not iustified. Hee that iudgeth me is God. q.d. I haue kept a good conscience in my Ministry, but God is my iudge, though my conscience pronounce me innocent, yet God is my sole iudge that iudgeth me and my conscience. Acts, 13. 38. 39. [Through this man is preached unto you the forgiuenesse of sinnes; and from all things from which yee could not be iustified by the Law of Moses; by him every one that believeth is iustified.

By which places (not to name more) it appeares plainly that iustification is opposed to accusation and condemnation: and therefore can signify nothing else but the defence and absolution of a person accused for an offender. Which thing is so cleere and evident that it cannot bee gainsaid, except by those alone who are wilfully blinde, and obstinately resoluued to contradict any truth, that makes against their inveterate errors. For our selues, we may not, nor dare not shut our eyes against so cleere light: nor ought we to be so bold when God hath acquainted vs with his meaning; as to follow another of our owne making. And therefore according to the Scriptures we acknowledge and maintaine, that as in other places where mention is made of the iustification of a sinner before God: so in the 2 and 4 Chapters of the Epist. to the Rom. and third Chapter of the Gal. (where the Doctrine thereof is directly handled) by *Iustification* nothing

thing else is meant; but the gracious act of Almighty God whereby he absolves a beleiuing sinner accused at the Tribunall of his Iustice, pronouncing him iust and acquitting him of all punishment for Christ's sake.

C A P. III.

*The Confutation of our Aduersaries cauilles against
our acceptation of the word Iustification.*



V R Aduersaries haue little to reply against these *Because Ibid.*
so plaine places. Sointhing they answer,namely. *Sect. 8.*

I That it cannot be denied but that *Iustification*, doth many times beare that sense we stand for. But with all they woulde haue vs obserue this rule that [*Quoduscunq; in Scripturis Deus dicitur iustificare impium; semper intelligendum est ex impi facere iustum. God cannot declare a man to be iust: but of vnjust hee must make him iust.*] And they giue the reason. Because the iudgement of God is according to truth, *Rom. 2.2.* Wee embrase this Rule and the reason of it, acknowledging that where euer there is *Iustification*, there must be iustice some way or other in the party iustified. But the question stands still in what manner God makes a sinner iust: whom hee in iudgement pronounceth so to be. They say by bestowing on him the grace of *Sanctification and perfect righteousness* inherent in his owne person. We affirme, that it is by imputing vnto him the *perfect righteousness of Christ*, accepting Christ's obedience for his. In which diuersity let vs come as neere them as truth will giue leaue. Thus farre wee goe along with them.

I That there is inherent righteousness bestowed vpon a sinner, whereby of vnholy, impure, yniust; he is made holy, cleane,

cleane, and iust. Wee all confess this worke of the *Holy Ghost* renewing man in the spirit of his minde, restoring in him the ^a image of God in ^a knowledge, righteousnesse, and holinesse. That the *Holy Ghost* dwels in the elect, as in
^a Eph. 4. 24.
^b Col. 3. 9.
^b 1. Cor. 3. 16.
^c & 6. 19.
^a Cor. 6. 16.
^d Rom. 8.
^e Rom. 12. 5.
^a Cor. 12. 11.
^d Ioh. 15. 4.
^e Ioh. 4. 14.

^b Temples dedicated to his seruice, which hee adorns by communicating vnto them his heauenly graces. That hee makes them liuing ^c members of Christ's body: and fruitfull ^d branches of that true Vine. That this grace infused is a fountaine of ^e liuing water springing vp to eternall life. These things we beleue and teach.

Wherefore whereas the Popish Doctors fall foule on our reformed writers, charging *Calvin* and others for denying all inherent righteousness in Belieuers, and maintaining only an imputed righteousness without them: Wee tell them 'tis a grosse calumny forged by perverse mindes, that list not to vnderstand mens plainest writings. Nor *Calvin*, nor any that ever maintained the truth with him, euer denied the *Righteousnesse of Sanctification*. But this hee holds and we also with the Scriptures, that the righteousness which iustifies vs in Gods iudgement is not in our selues: but all in *Christ*.

² That inherent righteousness or sanctification alway keep company with *Iustification*, in the same person. Seuered they are neuer in their common subiect (viz) a true believer; as appeares Rom. 8. 30. But that therefore they must be confounded for one and the same grace and worke of God; may be affirmed with as good reason: as that in the Sunne light and heat are all one: because alwaies ioined together.

³ That by this grace of inherent righteousness, a man is in some sort iustified before God. That is so farre as a man by the grace of God is become truly holy and good: so far God esteemeth him holy and good. God taketh notice of his owne

owne graces in his children, he approues of them and giues testimony of them in case it be needfull ; as appears by the righteousnesse of *Job, David, Zachary*, and other holy men; who were good and did good in Gods sight. Yea in the life to come when (all corruptions being vtterly done away.) the Saints shall bee invested with perfection of inherent holinesse: by the *Righteousnesse* of their owne, and not by any other shall they then appeare iust in Gods sight.

Thus farre we agree with them. But herein now wee differ, that although by the grace of Sanctification infused, God doe make him righteous & holy in some measure that was before altogether vnholy and wicked : neuerthelesse we affirme that by and for this holinesse, the best of Saints living never were nor shall be iustified in Gods sight ; that is pronounced iust and innocent before the Tribunall of his Justice. For we here take vp the forenamed rule laied down by our aduersaries, *Whomſoever God pronounceth to bee perfectly iust; bee muſt needs be made perfectly iust.* For Gods judgement is according to truth. Now that no man in this life, is made perfectly iust by any ſuch inherent holinesſe in him as is able to ouerſtand the ſeuere and exact triall of Gods judgment: is a truth witnessed by the Scripture and confefſed alwaies by the moſt holy Saints of God. Our aduersaries indeed ſtiffly plead the contrary : teaching that ſinne and corruption in the iuftified is vtterly abolished. The error & pride of whiche imagination wee ſhall ſhortly haue occation more at large to diſcouer vnto you. Meane while let thus much ſtand for good: that man being not made perfectly iust in himſelfe cannot thereby be declared perfectly iust before God: and therefore ſome other righteousneſſe, & not that of Sanctification is to be ſought for , whicheby a ſinner may be iuftified in Gods sight.

2

*Bec. Ibid. Pa-
rag. 9.*

To that argument of ours from the opposition of iustification to accusation and condemnation confirmed by so many places of Scripture; They answere. That this hinders nothing at all, both may agree to God who of his mercy iustifies some; (that is) makes them inherently iust; of his iustice condemnes other (that is) punishmenteth them. To which slight answers we make this short reply. That where words are opposite, (as they acknowledge these to be) there according to the lawes of opposition, they must carry opposite meaning. But vnto accusation, condemnation, and punishment nothing is opposite but defence, absolution, and pardon. Where therefore *Iustificare* is coupled with these words; it must needs beare this and no other meaning: of a bad man to make a good is not opposite to accusation, condemnation, or punishment of him: accused he may bee, condemned and punished iustly, and after made good.

I should but trouble you to allege more of their cavills. Let thus much suffice for the clearing of this point: That iustification and sanctification are to be distinguished and not confounded. The righteousnesse of the one is in vs, in its nature, true and good: but for its degree and measure, imperfect; and alwaies yoked with the remainder of naturall corruption. And therefore if a sinner should plead this before the judgement seat of God, (offring himselfe to bee iudged according to this righteousnesse and innocency) oh how soone his mouth would be stopped; and this confession wrung from out of his conscience; All my righteousnesse is as filthy raggis! And againe *Vilis sum*; I am vile, what shall I answer thee! But that other righteousnesse of iustification is without vs in Christ's possession: but ours by Gods gratiouse gift and acceptation, & this is every way perfect and vnreprooved in the severest judgement of God. And therefore

fore when a sinner is drawne before the bar of Gods iudgement, accused by the law, Satan, his conscience; convicted by the evidence of the fact, and to be now sentenced and deliuered to punishment by the vnpartiall iustice of God: In this case he hath to alleage for himselfe the allsufficient righteoueresse of a mighty Redeemer, who only hath done and suffered for him that which hee could never doe nor suffer for himselfe. This plea alone and no other in the world, can stop vp the mouth of Hell, confute the accusations of Satan, chase away the Terrors that haunt a guilty conscience, and appease the infinite indignation of an angry Judge. This alone will procure favour and absolution in the presence of that Judge of the whole world. This alone brings downe from heauen into our consciences that blessed peace, which passeth all vnderstanding; but of him that hath it. Whereby we rest our selues secure from feare of condemnation; being provided of a defence that will not faile vs, when after death we shall come into iudgement.

SECT. 2. CHAP. I.

*The Orthodox opinion concerning the manner of
Iustification by Faith, and the confutation
of Popish errors in this point.*

 Ating thus cleared the meaning of this word *Sect.2.c.1.* [Iustification] and shewed that the Scriptures, when they speake of the Iustification of a sinner before God, doe thereby vnderstand the absolution of him in iudgement from sinne and punishment. We are now vpon this ground to proceed vnto the further explication of this point, to enquire by what meanes & in what manner, this iustification of a sinner is accomplished: That

we may goe on more distinctly : I will reduce all our ensuing discourse of this point into three heads.

3 Gen. Heads.

First, touching the condition required in them that shall be iustified.

2 Secondly, the matter of our Iustification. (*viz.*) What righteouſneſſe is is wherefore a sinner is iustified.

3 Thirdly; touching the forme of iustification , in what the quality of this judiciall act of God , justifying a sinner, consisteth.

I Genera head Concerning the first at this time. The condition required in such as shall bee partakers of this grace of justification is true faith , whereto God hath ordinarily annexed this great priuiledge; That by faith and faith only , a sinner shall be iustified : This the Scriptures witness in tearmes as direct and exprefle, as any can be. [*Rom. 3. 28. wee conclude a man is iustified by faith without the workes of the Law.*] and *Rom. 4.9.* [*For we say that faith was imputed unto Abraham for righteousneſſe.*] and *Rom. 5.1.*] Then being iustified by faith, we have peace towards God through Iesus Christ our Lord.] With other the like places. Whence it is agreed vpon on all sides, that a sinner is iustified by faith: but touching the manner , how he is said to be iustified by faith, there is much controuersie and brawle, betweene the orthodoxe of the reformed Churches , and their aduersaries of *Rome* and *Holland*; the *Arminians*, and the *Papists*. The sentence of the reformed Churches touching this point , consisteth of two Branches.

First, that a sinner is iustified by faith , not properly as it is a quality or action ; which by it's owne dignity and merit, deserues at Gods hands remission of sinnes ; or is by Gods fauorable acceptance taken for the whole & perfect righteousness of the Law , which is otherwise

wife required of a sinner: but only in relation vnto the object of it, the righteousnesse of Christ; which it im-braceth and resteth vpon.

Secondly, that a sinner is iustified by faith in opposition vnto the righteousnesse of workes in the fulfilling of the Law. Whereby now no man can be iustified.

In this relative and inclusiue sense doe the reformed Churches take this proposition [*A man is iustified by faith*] They explaine themselves thus: There are two Covenants that God hath made with man; By one of which and by no other meanes in the world, saluation is to be obtained. The one is the couenant of workes, the tenor whereof is [*Doe this and thou shalt liue.*] This couenant is now vtterly void, in regard of vs; who through the weaknesse of our sinnefull flesh cannot possiblly fulfill the condition of obedience required thereby: and therefore we cannot expect iustification and life by this meanes. The other is the couenant of grace, the Tenor whereof is, Beleeue in the Lord *Iesu* and thou shalt be saued. The condition of this couenant is Faith: the performance whereof differs from the performance of the condition of that other couenant. Doe this and liue, is a compact of pure iustice wherein wages is giuen by debt, so that he which doth the work obeying the Law, may in strict iustice for the worke sake claime the wages, eternall life vpon iust desert. Beleeue this and liue is a compact offreest and purest mercy: wherein the reward of eternall life is giuen vs in favour for that which beares not the least proportion of worth with it: so that hee which performs the condition cannot yet demand the wages, as due vnto him in seuerity of iustice; but only by the grace of a free promise, the fulfilling of which he may humbly sue for. By whiche grand difference

ference betweene these two Couenants clearly expressed in Scriptures, it appeares manifestly that these two propositions. [*A man is iustified by workes,*] [*A man is iustified by faith,*] carry meanings vtterly opposite one to the other. The one is proper and formall : the other Metonymicall and relative. In this Proposition [*A man is iustified by workes*] we vnderstand all in proper and precise termes: That a righteous man who hath kept the law exactly in all points, is by and for the dignity and worth of that his obedience iustified in Gods sight from all blame and punishment whatsoeuer; because perfect obedience to the morall law in it selfe, for its own sake deserues the approbation of Gods seuerie iustice and the reward of heauen. But in that other proposition (*A man is iustified by Faith*) Wee must vnderstand all things relatively thus. A sinner is iustified in the sight of God from all sinne & punishment by faith (that is) by the obedience of Iesus Christ beleeuued on; and embraced by a true faith. Which act of iustification of a sinner, although it be properly the only worke of God, for the only merit of Christ, yet is it rightly ascribed vnto faith, and it alone, for as much as faith is that maine condition of that new couenant, which as we must performe if we will be iustified: so by the performance thereof wee are said to obtaine iustification and life. For when God by grace hath enabled vs to performe the condition of beleeuing; then doe we beginne to enjoy the benefit of the Couenant; then is the sentence of absolution pronounced in our consciences; which shall be after confirmed in our death; and published in the last iudgement. Secondly, our faith and no other grace directly respects the promises of the Gospell; accepting what God offers, sealing vnto the truth thereof by assenting thereto, and imbracing the benefit and fruit of it vnto

to it selfe, by relying wholly vpon it. This interpretation of that proposition thereformed Churches doe admit; and none other : rejecting as erronious and contrary to the Scriptures such glosses as ascribe ~~any~~ thing to the dignitie of faith ; or make any coimbtation betweene Faith and Workes, in the point of our Iustification. Amongst which there are three erronious assertions touching mans iustification by Faith, which we are briefly to examine and refute.

I That faith iustifieth vs [*Per modum cause efficientis & meritoriae*] as a proper efficient and meritorious cause. Which by it's owne worth and dignity deserues to obtaine iustification, remission of sinnes, & the grace of well doing.

This is the doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, which *Bellarmino* labours to proue in his 17. *Chap. lib. pr. de iustificatione*, where disputing against iustification by faith alone, hec tels vs. If we could be perswaded that faith doth iustifie [*impetrando, promerendo, & suo modo inchoando iustificationem,*] then we would neuer deny that loue, feare, hope, and other vertues did iustifie vs as well as faith. Wherupon hee sets himselfe to proue that there is in faith it selfe some efficacy and merit to obtaine and deserue iustification. His arguments are chiefly two.

I From those places of Scripture , wherein a man is said to be iustified, ^a *διδούσθη*, ^b *εν τοῖς*, ^c *τῷ τίκτῳ*. Or absolutely without article or preposition. *τίκτω περ fidem, ex fide*, or *fidei*. Wherein these Prepositions signifie, saith he, the true cause of our iustification. Which hee proues, 1. By the contrary, when a man is said to be iustified [*διδούσθη*, or *τοιχεύονται*]. This notes the true *efficient* deseruing cause of his iustification. Secondly, by the like In other places where we are said to be redeemed, saued, sanctified ; *per Christum, per sanguinem, per mortem, per vulgum*; and in the whole *II*

^a Gal.2.16.

^b Rom.5.1.

^c Rom.28.

^d Rom.4.2.

& 3.20.

Gal.2.16.

Iam.2.

to the *Heb.* The Saints are said to doe such and such things (*actu*) by faith. All signifying the proper cause.

2 From those places of Scripture which (faith he)plainely shew: Faith doth impetrare remissionem , & suo quidē modo meret. Such are those [*Thy faith hath saved thee*] or made thee whole. A speech that Christ vsed often , as to the ^awoman that washed his feet; to her ^b that had an issue of blood: To the ^cblinde man recovered of his sight. And that to the *Cananitish* woman [*O woman d great is thy faith*] now see what the merit of this Faith was , (*For his c saying goeth thy way the Diuell is gone out of thy daughter*) Thus Abraham, [*being f strengthened in Faith glorified God,*] who therefore iustified him for the merit of his faith. And againe in the eleventh to the *Heb.* by many examples we are taught that ^g*Heb. xi. 5. 6.* by ^g Faith / that is) by the merit and price of Faith *Enoch* & other men pleased God.

For answere herevnto.

I Vnto the Argument from the Proposition we reply; That if *in tuis actis & in tuis opere*, must bee needs strictly taken in the same kinde of causality:then the *Jesuites* should doe well to stand to that and make the similitude betweene Faith and works runne thus. A man is iustified (*by*) workes that is for the proper and only merits of his obedience; so a man is iustified (*by*) faith, that is for the only merit of his beleeving in Christ: and by that meanes both shall be true and effectuall causes of iustification. But if *Bellarmino* dare not thus presse the similitude for feare of being found guilty of despising the blood of the *New Covenant*, attributing that to the merit of faith which belongs only to the merit of Christ; hee must then giue vs that leaue to distinguish which he takes to himselfe; and if he fall to his *Qualifications* and *quodam modo's*: he must pardon if wee also seeke out such an interpretation.

^a Luke. 7. 50.
^b Mat. 9. 22.
^c Mar. 10. 51.
^d Mat. 15. 21.
^e Mar. 7. 29.

^f Rom. 4. 20.

pretation of those places; as may not crosse other *Scriptures*. Which for as much as they testify that (*we are iustified by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ*)^{i Rom.3.24.}
that (All finne is purged by the blood of Christ) that (*by the sacrifice of himselfe he hath put away finne*) and (*with offering hath consecrated for ever them that are sanctified.*)^{k Heb.1.3.}
 We dare not without horrible sacriledge ascribe the grace of our iustification vnto the worke and worth of any thing whatsoeuer in our selues; but wholy and only to the Righteousnesse of Christ. And therefore when the *Scriptures* say we are iustified (*by*) faith; wee take not the word (*By*) in this formall and legall sense; wee are iustified by the efficacy of our faith, or for the worth of our faith, according as 'tis vnderstood in iustification by works: but wee take it *Relatiuely and Instrumentally*: *Wee are iustified by faith (that is) by the righteousness of Christ, the benefit whereof vnto our iustification, we are made partakers of by faith, as the only grace which accepts of the promise, and giues vs assurance of the performance.* Hee that looked to the brasen Serpent and was cured, might truely bee said to bee healed (*by*) his looking on, though this action was no proper cause working the cure by any efficacy or dignity of it selfe; but was only a necessary condition required of them that would be healed, vpon the obedient obseruance whereof, God would shew them fauour: so he that looked on Christ belieuing in him, may truely be said to bee saued and iustified by faith, not as for the worth, and by the efficacy of that act of his; but as it is the condition of the promise of grace, that must necessarily goe before the performance of it to vs: vpon our obedience wherevnto God is pleased of his free grace to iustifie vs. Nor is this *Trope*, any way harsh, or vnuauall to put *Oppositum pro opposito, Relatum ad Correlatum, Habitum*.

Habitu[m] pro Objec[ti]o[n]e. In Sacramental locutions 'tis a generall custome, to put the signe for the thing signified: and the like is vsed in other passages *γένεσις τοῦ θεοῦ εἰναὶ νοεῖσθαι. Καὶ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ γένεσις τοῦ θεοῦ εἰναὶ νοεῖσθαι. Καὶ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰναὶ νοεῖσθαι.* And the word of God [rev. &c.] and *τοὺς νέων τοὺς τινας, τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστης* (and *τοὺς αἵλους τοὺς τινας, in the words of Faith) and Rōm.8.24. [*τὸν πατέρα τούτου σαμαρτυρῶντα. Σπερβούτα σαμαρτυρῶντα. Σπερβούτα σαμαρτυρῶντα.*] *Spe servati sumus (id est.) Christo in quem speramus.* Hope that is seene is not hope, that is, *res visa non sperata est.* That of Ignatius [*οὐκοῦ επονείται πάτερ]* Like to that (*Christ our joy*) *Anni spem credere Terre*)*

Vñrg. Georg. 1. And if we list not to bee contentious, 'tis plaine enough, that in those places, where the Apostle treats of Iustification by faith (*vix.*) the grace of God in Christ; opposing workes and faith, that is the law and the Gospele, the righteousnesse of the law, to the righteousnesse of the Gospele, which is no other but the righteousnesse of Christ. Thus faith is taken, *Gal. 3. 23.* Where he exprefly treats of iustification. But [*before faith came, we were kept under the Law, shut up unto the Faith, which should afterward be revealed*] That is, before Christ came; and the cleare exhibition of the Gospele, and the righteousnesse thereof: the Church was

9. Act. 13. 38. : kept vnder the ceremoniall law, as vnder a *Schoolmaster*, directing her vnto Christ, that so [*wee might be iustified by faith*] that is, not by the lesson of the law, but by Christ, typified and figured vnto vs therein.

2 Vnto the other argument prouing the merit of faith, we reply; that in those places is no ground at all for such a conceit. [*Thy faith hath saved thee,*] faith Christ to some whom he cured both in body and soule. But what? was it by the efficacy, and for the worth of their faith that this was done? No: As twas vertue went out of Christ that cured their bodily diseases; & his compassion that moued him to it: so twas his grace and merits, and free loue that healed their

n A. 6. 7. &
6. 5.
o 1. T. n. 3. 9.
& 4. 6.

p Gal. . 23.

their soules, and brought them pardon of their sinnes in the sight of God : Yet he saith; their faith sauued them , because by beleeveng the sonne of God , they receaued this fauour, though for their beleeuing they did not deserue it. God bestowes mercy where he finds faith, not because faith merits such fauour at his hands : but because hee is pleased to disperse his fauours in such an order, as himselfe hath appoyneted; and vpon such conditions as he thinkes good. To that of the *Canaanitish* woman: Her great faith could not claime by desert, that fauour which Christ shewed vnto her daughter: only Christ was pleased to honour her faith by his testimony of it; & to helpe the daughter at the mothers entreaty. Christ did it vpon that request of hers so instant & full of faith; But yet who can say shee merited ought at Christ's hands by that her faithfull and instant petition ? Her selfe yet living would deny it; and she doth deny it there , counting her selfe a dogge vnworthy of the childrens bread; when yet she beleeued strongly, and was a child of *Abraham* according to the faith. To that of *Abraham* who gaue glory to God, and of *Henoch* and others, who pleased God by their faith: We answeare ; that it is one thing for a man to gloriifie and please God by his obedience; tis another, by so doing to deserue ought at his hands. If God in much grace and fauour accept of the honour and contentment we are able to doe him by our faith & obedience: It follows not that therefore wee must in justice merit at his hands: Other arguments for them there are: but so weakly knitt, they fall in sunder of themselues. Against them wee haue to obiect the Scriptures, that so often say, [*We are iustified*] *gratia & gratis*; and the Councell of *Trent*, which they respect more then the Scriptures ; which hath defined thus: *Nihileorum qua iustificationem praecedunt, fidei, siue opera.*

opera, ipsam iustificationis gratiam promeretur, Sess. 6. cap. 8.
How then can they say Faith merits iustification.

Here our aduersaries haue two shifts to run vnto, whereby they would avoid the absurdity of this Assertion.

1 That this merit is not from vs: but of God. Because Faith is the gifte of Gods grace; and therefore though we be iustified by merit: yet we are iustified by grace, because merit is of grace.' Tis of grace that our faith merits.

Rom. 11. 6.

This you may be sure, is some of that simeake of the botomelesse pit, wherein hell vented out the *jesuites*, and they their darke imaginations; all to confound whaisoeuer is cleare and lightsome in Scripture. Scripture opposeth these paires; *Grace* and *Nature*, *Grace* and *Merit*. As the *Pelagians* of old confounded nature and grace, teaching that wee were saued by grace: yet affirming that we are also saued by nature, and the naturall strength of free-will. VVhich they sauued thus. To be saued by nature, is to bee saued by grace: for nature is of Gods grace and giuing. So these confound grace and merit, making a thing meritorious, because tis of grace. Faith merits because its Gods gracious gift. Nothing more contradictory. If it be his gift, how doth it merit, or of whom? of man it may, of God it cannot: vnlesse wee will senslessly affirme, that the gifte deserues something of the givuer. That he that giues an hundred pound freely, is thereby bound to giue an hundred more. Had they said that faith is good, because of Gods giuing; that were true, and wee may grant them that God is honoured and pleased with his own gifts: but that every good thing merits, and that we can deserue of God by his owne gifts, is affirmed without all reason, or scriptures; and will neuer be proued by either.

But there is yet another shift.

2 Faith merits iustification [*Non de condigno*] not of the worthinesse

worthinesse of it: but [*de Congruo*] of the fitnessse: that is, God in iustice is not bound to bestow iustification where there is faith: but yet in fitnessse he ought to doe it. So that if he doe not iustifie him that belieues: hee is likely to omit a thing very fit and agreeable. This distinction is a meere imposture and collusion, *Bellarmino* in dealing with it seemes to haue a dogge by the eares, hee is loath to loose him: yet knowes not well how to hold him. If hee bee vrged where Scriptures make any the least intimation of such a distinction: he referres you to Divines, that is, Popish Schoole-men, who out of their owne imagination haue forged it, and in time made it authenticall. But he sticks in the mire, when he is to shew what merit of *Condignity* and merit of *Congruity* is. Merits of condignity are worke, to which wages is due of iustice. What then are merits of congruity? Such worke whereto wages is not due by any iustice. As for example: he that labours the whole day in the Vineyard, merits a penny of condignity: because in iustice his labour is worth his hire. But he that for an houres worke, receaues a penny, hee deserves it of congruity: because though his labour bee not worth it, yet hee was promised a penny by him that set him on worke: Then which fond imagination nothing can bee more ridiculous, and contrary to common sense. For the merit of any worke is the proportionableness of its worth with the reward. Now in reason wherein ariseth this proportion of any worke with that reward? Stands it in the dignitie of the worke it selfe; or in the compact made betweene him that worketh and him that rewardeth? It is apparent that the worke is deseruing or not deseruing according to its owne nature, not according to a compact made. He that promiseth vnto one more for a little worke, then to another for a great deale in the same kinde: doth not by such a compact

pact make the little laboure of the one more deseruing then the others great paines. We must locke to the worke, what it is in its owne nature: and as it is of some worth or no worth, so account it deseruing or not deseruing. Wherefore when in the distinction they make some merits of con-dignity or worthinesse, some of congruity, or of fitnessse without worthinesse, they offend two waies, grossly against two rules of reason. First in opposing termes not opposite: Worthinesse and fitnessse: being the same, if you take them in regard of the worke. For that which deserues a reward worthily, deserues it fitly: (how else is it worthy of the reward, if the reward bee not fit for it?) and that which deserues it fitly (if it deserues,) it deserues it worthily.

2 In distinguishing vpon termes that doe not *convenire toti*. For worthinesse agrees to merit only: but fitnessse belongs to compact. So that in plainer English, the distinction runnes thus. Merits or deserts, are of two sorts. Some, that are merits and doe deserue because they are worthy of a reward: others that are no merits and doe not deserue because they are not worthy of the reward, but only obtaine it, *ex Congreso*, in regard of compact and promise. For this rule is most certaine, *That a worke which deserues nothing by its owne worthiness: can never deserue any thing by compact or promise.* The *Iesuits* are senseleſſe in defending the contrary.

If (faith Bellarmine) a King promise a Begger 1000^l. a yeare, vpon no condition, then indeed the Begger doth not deserue it. But if vpon condition hee shall doe some small matter, as that he shall come to the Court and fetch it, or bring a Posie of flowres with him, now the Begger deserues it: and he may come to the King, and tell him, he hath merited his 1000^l a yeare. Every man, but a *Iesuite*, would say 'twere extreme impudency in a Begger to make such a demand,

maunde, so derogatorily to the Kings gracious bountie. Nor can it helpe them to say , that a promise bindes vnto performance, so that God should be vnjust and vntrue, if he should not bestow the reward promised , although the workes bee not equall to the reward. For Gods iustice and truth in performing his promise , doe not imply our merit in performing the condition. Wee doe not deserue by our well-doing; because God is iust in his rewarding. And the reason is manifest ; Because God in making the promise , respected mereley the freenesse and bounty of his owne grace, not the worthinessse of our workes. And therefore that obligation whereby he hath tyed himselfe to performance , is founded mereley in his owne truth: not a iot in our merit. Wherefore when they tell vs, that faith merits iustification [*de Congruo*] they intrap themselves in a grosse contradiction ; seeing to deserue [*de Congruo*] is not to deserue at all; but onely to receiue the reward by meere promise : God hauing promised to iustifie beleeuers. Thus much touching the first assertion, that Faith is the proper cause of *Iustification*, working it by its owne efficacy and merits.

CHAP. II.

*The confutation of the Arminian error, shewing
that faith doth not iustifie, sensu proprio,
as it is an act of ours.*

 He seconde error about this point is of the *Arminians*, with whom also the Papists agree : Tis this.

2 That we are iustified by faith *sensu proprio*, that is, the act of beleeuing, in that *rd credere*, is imputed to vs for righteousness, being accepted of God and accounted

vnto vs for that whole righteousnesse of the Law which we were bound to performe. So that our very Faith is that righteousnesse, for which wee are iustified in the sight of God; *non quidem merito suo: sed propter gratuitam acceptationem Dei.*

The Authors of this opinion are *Faustus Socinus*, that vnhappy *Hereticke*, in his most blasphemous booke [*de Christo servatore:*] and *Michael Servetus a Spaniard*, in his second booke [*de Lege & Evangelio*] which errours are confuted by *Calvin* in his *Opuscula*. A stiffe defender of this opinion was *Christophorus Ostorodius* a Polonian, in his disputationes *contra Georgium Tradely*, who for this and other pestilent errours about the Article of mans redemption, was with his companion *Andreas Vaidonitus* banished the Low Countryes where he had seated himselfe and published his opinions; *Arminius*, and his followers haue, beene cheefe promoters of it. *Arminius* himselfe, as in other his opinions: so in the publishing of this vset much closenesse & cunning conveyance. In his private disputationes [*Tit. de iustificatione*] he seemes plainly to condemne it, saying that it is an abuse to say that *Fides est causa formalis Iustificationis*, and an errour to affirme [That Christ hath delivered, *ut fidei dignitate & merito iustificemur.*] In his publique disputationes he opens himselfe somewhat plainly: yet darkely enough [*Thes. 19. de Iustificat. Thes. 7.*] These are his words. [*Fidei vero iustificatio tribuitur, non quod illa sit iustitia ipsa que rigido & seuero Dei iudicio opponi posset; quamquam Deo grata: sed quod in iudicio misericordia triumphans supra iudicium absolutionem a peccatis obtineat & gratiouse in iustitiam imputetur. Cuius rei causa est tum Deus iustus & misericors, tum Christus obedientia, oblatione & intercessione (uâ secundum Deum in beneplacito & mandato ipsius)*]

ipius.] Here faith it selfe is imputed for righteousness. But tis not in Gods seuerre iudgement, but in his iudgement of mercy. Faith in it selfe is not worthy : but yet Christ by his merits hath deserued that God will gratiouly accept of it. This opinion published was quickly contradicted : wherevpon *Arminius* makes knowne his minde in plainer termes, *In declaracione sententie ad ordines Holland, & Westfalie* he confesseth that in the forenamed *Thesis* his meaning was, that [*ipsa fides tanquam actus iuxta Evangelij manuatum* ^{Pag 65.} *præstitus imputatur coram Deo in, siue ad iustitiam, id est in gratia, cum non sit ipsi metu iustitia Legis.* And in his *Responsione ad 31. Artic.art. 4.* hee brancheth out his opinion in three distinct propositions.

- 1 *Iustitia Christi imputatur nobis.*
- 2 *Iustitia Christi imputatur in iustitiam.*
- 3 *Tò credere imputatur in iustitiam.*

The first of these Propositions, he grants : That Christ's Righteousnesse is imputed to vs. The second hee denies, That Christ's righteousness is imputed for righteousness. The third he grants, that the act of beleueing is imputed for righteousness. Here bee mysteries in these Propositions, hereafter to be vnsfolded. Wee now meddle with the last which yet is more roundly expressed by *Arminius* in his *Episolle ad Hypolitum Leg.Princip.Pap.* [*Ipsum Fidei actu* ^{e Antibel. pap.} *tò credere, dico imputari in iustitiam, id est sensu proprio non* ^{106.} *metonymice*] The same is the opinion of his fellowes the Remonstrants, of ^c *Vorstius*, of ^d *Peter Bertius*, of ^e *Episcopus* and the ^f rest. With whom *Bellarmino* agrees pat [*Lib. 1.de Iust.cap.17.* When vpon that *Rom.4.* [*His faith is imputed for righteousness.*] he saith thus. *Vbi ipsa fides censetur esse iustitia, ac per hoc non apprehendit fides iustitiam Christi: sed ipsa fides in Christum est iustitia.*] In summe,

^c *Antibel. pap.*
^d *Collat. cum Sib. Lubber.*

^e *Thesb.de Justific.*

^f *Remonstrant.*
in Col. De plessi

Art. 2. Antih.

^z (*Statuumus*
Deum Fidem
nostram nobis
imputare per o-
bedientiam :
eaqng. (& nos
in illa) acceptos

their opinion runnes thus. God in the legall couenant required the exact obedience of his commandement: but now in the couenant of grace, he requires faith, which in his gracious estimation stands in steed of that obedience to the morall law, which we ought to performe. Which comes to passe by the merit of Christ; for whose sake God accounts our imperfect faith to be perfect obedience. This assertion we reiect as erronious, and in place thereof wee defend this *Proposition*. God doth not iustifie a man by faith properly, imputing vnto him faith in Christ for his perfect obedience to the Law, and therefore accounting him iust and innocent in his sight. Which we proue by these Reasons.

- n** **i** We are not iustified by any worke of our owne. But belieuing is an act of our own: Therefore by the act of belieuing we are not iustified.

The Major is most manifest by the Scriptures, which teach that we are sau'd by grace, *Ephes. 2.5.* [*and therefore not by the workes of Righteousnesse which we had wrought.*] *Tit. 3. 6.* [*For if it bee of Workes, then were grace no more grace,*] *Rom. 11. 6.*

The Minor is likewise evident. [*That faith is a worke of ours.*] For though *Ioh. 6. 29.* it bee laid, [*This is the worke of God that yee beleue in him whom he hath sent*] yet will not our aduersaries conclude thence, that Faith is Gods worke within vs, and not our worke by his helpe. For so should they runne into that absurdity which they would fasten vpon vs. (*viz.*) That when a man belieues, tis not man belieues: but God belieues in him. To belieue, though it be done by Gods aide: yet tis we that doe it; and the act is properly ours. And being so, we conclude, that by it we are not iustified in Gods sight.

Here two exceptions may be made.

i. First

1 First that wee are not iustified by any worke of our owne (*viz.*) which we our selues doe by our owne strength without the helpe of grace : But yet we may be iustified by some worke which we doe (*viz.*) by the aide of grace; and such a worke is faith. We answer. This distinction of works done without grace and workes done by grace, was devised by one that had neither wit nor grace ; being a Tricke to elude the force of such Scriptures as exclude indefinitely all workes from our iustification , without distinguishing either of time when they are done , before or after ; or of the ayde and helpe whereby they are done, whether by nature or by grace. Wherfore it is without all ground in *Scripture* thus to interpret these propositions. *A man* is not iustified by workes (that is) by workes done by the power of nature before and without grace. *A man* is iustified by Grace (that is) by workes done by aide of grace. These interpretations are meere forged inventions of froward mindes, affirmed but not proued : as we shall more hereafter declare,

2 That we are not iustified by any workes of our own, (that is) by any workes of the Law : but by a worke of the Gospell such as faith is we may be iustified. *Male res agitur vbi opus est tot Remedyis* (saith Erasmus in another case.) It is acertaine signe of an vntrue opinion when it must bee bolstered vp with so many distinctions . Nor yet hath this distinction any ground in Scripture, or in reason: for both tell vs that the workes commanded in the Law, & workes commanded in the Gospell are one and the same for the substance of them, what worke can bee named, that is inioyned vs in the new Testament , which is not also commanded vs in that summary precept of the Morall Law , [*Thou shal loue the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soule and with all thy strength , and with all thy mide , and thy neighbour.*

neighbour as thy selfe.] *Luc. 10. 27, De. 6. 5.* What sin is there against the Gospell, that is not a transgression of the Law? If the Gospell command charity, is it any other then that which the Law commands: If the Gospell command faith, doth not the Law enioyne the same? you will say no. It doth not command faith in Christ. I answere, yea, it doth: For that which commands vs in generall to beleue what euer God shall propose vnto vs: commands vs also to beleue in Christ, as soone as God shall make knowne that tis his will we should beleue in him. The Gospell disc. uers vnto vs the Obiect; the Law commands vs the obedience of believing it. Wherefore Faith, for the substance of the Grace & workes done by vs, is a worke of the law; and so to be iustified by the action of belieuing, is to bee iustified by workes & by our owne righer ouerthenesse, contrary to the Scriptures; and tha: *Phil. 3. 9.* (*That I may be found not, &c.*) This of the first Reason.

2 God accounts that only for perfect Righteousnesse of the Law, which is so indeed and truth.

But Faith is not the perfect fulfilling of the Law.

Therefore God doth not account it for such.

The Minor is granted by our adversaries; that faith is not the exact iustice of the Law; such as can stand before the severity of Gods iudgements. The Major must bee proued: that God accounts not that for perfect iustice which is not perfect indeed. This appeares by that *Rom. 2. 2.* [*The iudgement of God is according to truth.*] Where therefore any thing is not truely good and perfect: there God esteemes it not so. Here also twill be excepted.

That God sometime iudgeth *Iudicio iustitiae*, according to exact iustice; and then he iudgeth nothing perfectly iust, but that which hath true perfection of Justice in it. Sometimes

times he iudgeth *iudicio misericordiae*; according to mercy: and so he may esteeme a man perfectly righteous for that which is not perfect righteousness in it selfe; namely for his Faith.

Surely, this is a trimme distinction thus applyed, that sets Gods mercy and truth together by the eares. As who would say, when God iudgeth out of mercy: hee then doth not judge according to truth. The Scriptures doe not acquaint vs with any such mercifull iudgement of God. This they doe acquaint vs with, that God iudgeth according to mercy, not when he doth pronounce and cleare a sinner to be perfectly righteous for that righteousness which is truly imperfect: but when he iudgeth a sinner to be righteous for that righteousness which is perfect; but is not his owne. In this judgement there is both truth and mercy. Truth, in that he esteemes me perfectly righteous, for that righteousness sake which is euery way perfect: and mercy, that he accepteth for sinne, that righteousness which is performed for me by Christ my surety; but is not mine owne. Other mercifull judgement of God besides this, we acknowledge none.

3 We are not iustified by two righteousnesses existing in two divers subiects. But if we be iustified by the worke offaith: we shall be iustified partly by that righteousness which is in vs, (viz.) of faith: partly by the righteousness of Christ without vs.

Ergo we are not iustified by faith properly.

The minor is apparent. The righteousness of faith is inherent in vs, and by it we are iustified (say our aduersaries.) The righteousness of Christ is inherent in him: and by it are we iustified, say the Scriptures. [*Being now iustified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.*] Rom. 5. 9. & v. 19. [*By the obedience of one, many shall be made iust.*]

Wherfore

Wherefore either wee are properly iustified by both , or there is an error, and one part must stand out. We cannot be properly iustified by both, for our owne faith & Christ's obedience too: for if we be perfectly iust in Gods sight for our owne faith, what need the imputation of Christ's obedience to make vs iust? If for Christ's righteousness we be perfectly iustified: how can God account vs perfectly iust for our faith? *Arminius* and his friends , seeing these things cannot stand together ; haue (according to the good will which they beare toward the righteousness of Christ) kept in our faith, and thrust out Christ's obedience , denying vtterly that it is imputed vnto vs for righteousness. But my brethren, (which I hope make a better choice) seeing it cannot part with ours: let vs part with our owne righteousness, leaning wholy vpon the righteousness of Christ; and seeking for the comfort of our iustification in his perfect obedience, and not in our weake and imperfect faith. These reasons may suffice to shew the errore of that assertion. Wee are iustified by faith *sensu proprio*, God accepting the act of belieueng for the perfect obedience of the Law. And therefore that in those places, where 'tis said, [*Faith is imputed for Righteousnesse,*] the phrase is to bee expounded metonymicall, (that is) Christ's righteousness belieuued on by faith, is imputed to the belieuer for righteousness.

We are iauded
by grace tho-
rough faith.
Ephes.2.8.

Whereas our adversaries say that Faith of its owne dignitie and deseru, doth not obtaine this fauour of God , to bee esteemed for the perfect righteousness of the morall Law: but this comes to passe only by the merits of Christ , who hath procured this grace vnto vs, that God should thus accept of our faith: we answere, that this is affirmed , but 'tis not proued. They speake a little more fauorably then the *Romanists*, who make faith of it selfe to merit iustification. these

these will haue it not to merit it; but to be graciously accepted for righteousnesse. But wee finde not in Scripture any such doctrine as this, [*Christ hath merited that wee shoulde be iustified for our faith.*,] or [*Christ hath merited for our faith, that faith shoulde be esteemed by God for that perfect iustice of the Law; whereby wee are iustified in Gods sight.*] These things the Scriptures teach not: they teach, that Christ is our righteousness, and that wee are iustified by his blood and obedience. But that he hath merited by his obedience, that we shoulde bee iustified by our owne obedience and righteousness, is a perverse assertion of men that loue to runne about the bush, and leauing the straight, to runne in crooked and froward waies. And it differes little from the like shifte of the Disciples of *Rome*, who to maintaine merit of our workes and of *Christ* too; salue it with this trick. *Christ hath merited that we might merit.* But we acknowledge, as no other merit, but that of *Christ*; so no other righteousness to justification, but this alone. Thus much of the second assertion.

C H A P. III.

The confutation of Popish Doctrine, that other graces doe iustifie vs, and not faith alone.



He third and last followes, wherein the controverstie is betweene vs and those of *Rome*; whose assertion is: that

3 A sinner is not iustified by faith alone, but also by other vertues and graces; as *Hope, Love, Repentance, Feare of God, &c.*

This we also reject as an error, contrary to the Scriptures whereby we are taught, that a man is iustified by faith alone.

F • • • • • For

For opening the truth of which point you must call to mind the different acceptation of the word *Iustifie*: wherein it is taken by vs, and by our adversaries. With them to *Iustifie* is all one, as to *Sanctifie*: of vniust and vnholy, to make inherently iust and holy. With vs to *Iustifie* is to absolve an offender, quitting him from blame and punishment. According to these different acceptations, this proposition [a man is iustified by faith alone] hath a double meaning; one thus [A man by faith alone is inherently sanctified] another thus: [A man by faith alone obtaines absolution in Gods judgement, from all faultinesse and punishment.] This latter meaning onely is true, and tis that only which is defended by vs of the reformed Churches; Namely, that faith onely is the grace of God whereby a sinner beleeving the promise, and resting himselfe vpon the righteousness of Christ, receiuers mercy from God in absoluing him from the fault and punishment of all his transgressions: and is accounted righteous for Christ's sake. Which gracious priuiledge God hath annexed vnto faith, as vnto the condition of the New couenant, and not vnto Loue, Hope, Feare, Repentance, or any other grace; For not these, but faith onely, respecteth the promise of the Gospell. The former sense of that proposition, is false and absurd, *viz.* [A man by faith alone is inherently sanctified] nor doe any of the reformed Churches maintaine such a construction thereof. Wherefore when *Bellarmino* and his complices dispute eagerly against iustification by faith alone, those arguments where-with they suppose to smite through the truth of our assertion, are let flye at a wrong marke; being all aymed at this Butte, (*viz.*) to proue; that a man is sanctified by other inherent graces as well as faith. Which point we easily yeeld them, confessing that inherent righteousness, consists not of

one, but of the manifold graces of Gods spirit, wrought in ^{* manibus}
 the heart of such as are regenerate. Neuerthelesse for the ^{xædoto}
^{1. Pet. 4. 10.} shewing of some points which may be doubted of; Let vs
 briefly take a view of the chiefe passages of Bellarmines
 long discourse; which hee maintaines from the twelfth
 chapter of his first booke *de Iustificatione*, to the end. For to
 proue that a man is iustified not by faith alone. Of his Ar-
 guments which are few, I shall name threē onely, which are
 materiall.

1 If other vertues justifie as well as faith, then not faith ^{1 Arg. Bell.}
 alone.

But other vertues doe justifie, Therefore, &c.

The Minor he proues out of the Councell of Trent
 Sess. 6. cap. 6. where seauen preparatory graces to justi-
 fication, are reckoned vp.

1 Faith. 2 The Fearing of God. 3 Hope in his mercy.
 4 Loue of God, as the fountaine of iustice (& ad benefa-
 toris, faith Bellarmine) 5 Repentance, a sorrow and de-
 testation of sinne. 6 A desire of receaving the Sacra-
 ment of Baptisme. 7 A purpose to lead a new life, and
 keepe Gods Commandements. All these (faith Bellar-
 mine) doe justifie a man, *Preparatorie*; antecedenter,
 dispositiue. Faith, that's the root and beginning of our
 justification, the rest follow in order; all must goe be-
 fore as needfull preparations: & justification followes
 as the effect of all in common, &c. Ergo, Not of Faith
 alone. The ^b Jesuite goes ouer every particular, to
 shew by Scriptures what force each of those graces
 haue to iustifie. But tis not worth while to repeat his
 proofes. Vnto the Argument, we answere two things.

1 That it is framed vpon the error which puts out of
 frame the whole dispute of our Adversaries, about this Ar-

ticle of *Justification*; namely, that Regeneration and Sanctification is all one thing with justification; and that to iustifie a sinner is nothing but to doe away inherent corruption, by infusion of inherent righteousness. This wee haue heretofore by the Scriptures cleared to be false; and therefore this argument prouing our sanctification to bee wrought by other graces as well as by faith, toucheth not the point of Justification in the remission of sinnes, which faith alone obtaineth through the promise.

2 Touching these graces which they make preparatory vnto justification, that is to sanctification: We answere, that tis a Philosophicall dreame of such as measure out the workes of Gods spirit in mans conuersion, according to *Aristotles Physicks*; and those disputes touching praevious, or fore-going dispositions, that qualifie the matter for receauing of the forme. We acknowledge, that in mans regeneration all graces of the Spirit are not perfected at once. But as the ioints and sinewes in the body: so the graces of sanctification in the spirituall new birth, are at first weake & feeble: which in continuance of time gather more strength, according to our growth in Christ. But yet these are true for the substance: though imperfect in their degrees and measure. There is now true spirituall life in such a one which was before dead in sinne: although there be not the free and able exercise of all the vitall powers. Health there is, but not entire from all degrees of sicknesse, and every kinde of disease. Wherefore we affirme that these vertues, which are by our adversaries reckoned only as dispositions vnto regeneration, are, if they be true and not counterfeit metall, the maine parts and fruits of regeneration.

Hence we belieue that these are foule errors (*viz.*) To teach that a man without grace by the power of his freewill

may

may dispose himſelfe to his regeneration, by beleeuing in Christ, fearing and louing of God, hoping of his mercy, repenting of his ſinnes, resoluing vpon amendment, and all this with true and ſincere affection: or to teach if a man can-
not doe theſe things of his owne meere strength and free will; yet by the ſpeciall aide of God inciting and helping him he may doe them whilſt he is vtterly vnsanctified in *ſtatu peccati*. That true faith, and feare, and hope, and loue, & repen-
tance, and purpose of reformation, are vertues & graces in a man that is yet graceleſſe and without vertue, be-
caule deſtitute of ſanctification. That theſe graces conſiſting in the inward motion of the ſoule, and change of the affec-
tions, are wrought in man, not by any ſanctifying grace of the *Holy Ghost*, inwardly touching the heart: but by ſome other
kinde of vertue and aid (they knowe not what) ^a externall, ^{a Lib.1. cap.21.} exciting and helping forward the strength of nature: All ^{Nec tamen eſt à Deo intus inha-}
theſe are monſtrous and miſhapen imaginations, bred in ^{bitate, per gra-}
proud hearts that would faine ſhare the glory of their con- ^{tiam inſtitucan-}
verſion, betweene Gods grace and their owne free will, and ^{tem: ſed extre-}
maintained by curious heads, whom Philosophicall ſpecu- ^{ſius aduauancie}
lations haue transported beyond the ſimplicity of divine ^{& excitanie.} ^{Eti Cap.13.}
truth. The Scripture ſpeakes otherwise of theſe graces, as of ^{Pag.311.H.}
theſe that belong to ſuch as are not in the way to bee made
good, but are made ſo already. [*Yee are all the children of*
God by faith in Iefus Christ] ſaith the Apostle Paul, *Gal.3.28*:
whoſoever ſhall confeffe that Iefus is the ſonne of God: God
dwelleth in him and he in God.] ſaith *Ioh.1. Ioh.4.15.* and
Chap.5.1. [*Whoſoever beleeueth that Iefus is that Christ, is*
borne of God.] Doe we by true faith become the children of
God, borne of him, in whom hee dwelleth and wee in him,
when as yet in the meane time wee are yet vnsanctified, vnholy, vncleane, and not in the ſtate of grace? *Bellarmino* will

proue that a man may haue faith ; yet not bee the child of God: out of *John* i 12. [*As many as receaued him, so them he gaue power to become the sonnes of God: euен to them that beleue on his name.*] See (faith hee) they that beleue are not yet, but haue power if they lift, to become the sonnes of God, (*viz.*) by going on further from faith to hope & loue, and the rest of the *Tridentine* dispositions. For tis loue properly and not faith, that makes vs the sonnes of God; as hee would proue (contrary to that exprefſe place of the *Galat.*) out of the *i Ep. of John*, where the Apostle hath much excellent matter , but nothing to that purpose. To the place of *John*, we anſwere, that the *Iefuite* playeth with the ambiguity of the word *ἴχθυς* , which is not here a liberty to doe what we list; as if we could at our pleasure become Gods adopted sonnes: but tis a right and priuiledge which *Christ* the naturall Son bestowes on true beleueers, to be made Gods adopted sonnes, and fo coheires with him of the heauenly inheritance. When is this priuiledge of adoption bestowed? Then when they beleue, and affoone as they beleue , before they be regenerate? No, Saint *John* denies it. [*He gives power to be the sonnes of God, euен to those that beleue in him.*] Who be they ? He anſwertes, *verſ. 15.* [*Which were borne not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*] Faith then is not a preparatiue to *Inſtitution*, but a part of it.

Feare.
b *Pſ. 111. 10.*
Prov. 1. 7.
Faith is Radix:
a part of the
tree

And is not Feare of God too ? No , faith *Bellarmino*. That is the b beginning of wiſdome (that is) of perfect iuſtification. A bad interpretation , but a worse argument. Tis the beginning, therefore not a part. Nay; If the feare of God be the *Alpha* of Christian graces, certainly it ſelue makes one letter of that *Alphabet.* Tis ſuch a beginning of wiſdome : as it ſelue is wiſdome too. Else God himſelf de-
ceiuſ

ceives vs: who, as it is, Job.28.28 [Said unto man: Behold the feare of the Lord that is wiſdome, and to depart from evill is understanding.] And therefore to take it in the Iesuites gloſſe; Feare of God is iuſtification as well as the beginning of it.

For hope; If it be true, (viz.) [That c which makes not a-ſhamed,] which is the d Anchor of the ſoule, ſure and ſteadfast, e Rom.5.5. that entereth within the waile.] It would be knowne what difference the Iesuite will put betweene that Hope which is in a man before: and that which is in him after his faneſti- cation. If he ſay, it diſfers only in degree: then he grants, tis the ſame in ſubſtance: whence we haue a faire poſition; that man ſanctified and vnsanctified, is alike capable of the ſaving Graces of Gods Spirit.

The like we ſay for loue of God, if it be ſincere and without diſſimulation bred in the heart: Vpon thoſe ſpirituall conſiderations not only of Gods mercy in Christ: but alſo of his iuſtice and infinite righteouſneſſe; (For ſo the Trent Fathers will haue this loue to reſpect God, ut fontem Iuſtitiae) then we affirme this ſpirituall loue is not to be found but on- ly in thoſe Hearts, that are in ſome meaſure regeneratē and made ſpirituall. In [whom e this loue of God is ſhed abroad by the Holy Ghost that is giuen to them.] as the a Apostle ſpea- keth. This Bellarmine is ſoone forced to grant: yet he puts it off with a diſtinction [No man can loue God perfectly with all his heart, without the holy Ghost: but loue him he may im- perfectly without the Holy Ghost dwelleth in him, though not without the ſpeciall aid of God.] Whereto wee anſwere; tis one thing to loue God perfectly, and another to loue him truely. To loue him perfectly, is to loue him with all the heart, all the ſoule, all the minde, and all the ſtrength: which we grant no man can doe without the Holy Ghost: but wee also

Hope.

d Heb.6.18.

Loue.

e Rom.5.5.

a Rom 5.5.

also affirme, that no man did or shall euer doe it in this life, so long as there is lustfull corruption in him causing any the least aversion of his soule from God in any motion thereof. So that if none haue the *Holy Ghost* abiding in them; but such in whom loue is thus perfected; he must be confined with the Saints in heauen, and not haue his dwelling with the faithfull on earth. But if i nperfe^t Loue of God be also from the *Holy Ghost*, dwelling in the hearts of the Godly, who loue God truely in vnseigned vprightnesse of heart; though in much imperfection by reason of sinne, which diverts the heart vnto other pleasures: then it must be knowne of the Jesuite, what he meanes by imperfect loue. Is it false loue such, as a meere natural man may conceave vpon generall grounds: That God is good, the chiefest good,iust,hol-ly, and full of all excellency? He will not say for shame, this is a true preparatiue vnto *Iustification*. Is it true loue, but in its degree imperfect, not so vigorous, so vehement, so hot as coales of *Juniper*: yet such as hath some strength & warmth of spirituall affection? Then we require that these men will draw vs out a line by the rule of the Scriptures, and to tell vs how farre the true loue of God may come, without the grace of the *Holy Ghost* sanctifying the heart: But after 'tis past such a degree, then there is required the sanctifying grace of the *Holy Ghost* for it. Twill trouble their Mathematickes to describe vnto vs in what degree of perfection that Wa-mans loue was situated, whose example they alleadge for a proofe of this point out of *Luke 7.47*. [*Her sinnes which were many, are forgiuen her, for she loued much.*] Can Bel-larmine tell vs how much this was? that so by that patterne we may knowe how farre men goe in the true loue of God before they be at all sanctified by inherent grace? For such wonders they would make vs beleue concerning this peni-
tent

tent sinner; that when her soule was full offaith and loue to Christ, her heart full of sorrow, her eyes full of teares for her sinnes; yet for all that shee was a gracelesse , vnholy person, whose *Loue*, and *Faith*, and *Sorrow*, came not from the sanctifying grace of the *Holy Ghost*, but only from free will hel-
ped with some kinde of externall aide of God.

Wee haue not Faith to beleue such mysteries as these. Nor yet in the last place can we conceiue how there should be true repentance with a sincere purpose of reformation & obedience, where the Heart is not changed and renued by the holy Ghost. That godly sorrow and hatred of sinne should spring out of a gracelesse heart, that so holy a resolution of amendment of life should bee in an vnholy person; be assertions so contradictory and jarring : that no Christian eare can with patience endure to heare them. Wee con-
clude then touching these dispositions vnto Sanctification, that if these graces be true , they are parts & chiefe branches of inherent righteousness. But if they be false and counter-
feit , they are not so much as preparations therewnto. So
much of this first Argument: wherein yet one of these seuen dispositions first reckoned vp is omitted (*viz.*) a desire of receauing the Sacrement of Baptisme.(that is) A man thats baptised in his youth, afterward, before he be iustified , must haue a desire to be rebaptised. For what is it for one baptis-
ed to desire to receave that Sacrement againe ? This con-
ceit is so absurd that howeuer *Bellarmino* reckon it vp a-
mong the other Dispositions; because of the authority of the Councell of *Trent*: yet ^a *Becanus* giues it ouer in plaine field, numbring these fore-naming six graces only , chusing rather to venture the Councells credit , then his owne, by defending an vreasonable position.

*Repentance.
Reformati-
on.*

*Not of *Abab*
or *Iudas*.*

2 . *Argument.* If Faith alone doe iustifie vs ; then it 2. Arg.

G may

*a Tres 2. Tract.
4. c.3. Quæf.3.
Bell.lib. 1. c.1 q.*

may doe it when other graces are absent; as well as when they are present. For seeing the vertue of justifying vs depends vpon Faith alone: and that in this act it receiuers no aide from any other grace; It followeth that it needs not the company of any other grace: as in the law of sense. If the whole force of burning proceed onely from heat: then where heat is, though there be no other qualities, yet there will bee burning; yea if faith only haue force to justifie, it will follow, that it may iustifie not only in the absence of other graces: but in the presence of the contrary vices. For as the absence of other graces doth not hinder: so the presence of other vices will not hinder faith one iota in its office of justifying.

But twere absurd to affirme, that Faith can justifie without other vertues with other vices, *Ergo,*
The force of justifying is not in faith alone.

To this we answere. That this sophisme is fashioned vp on the same blocke with the former, that to justifie and sanctify are all one. In which sense we confess the consequence is unavoidable. If faith alone by its owne vertue and force did sanctify: then it would effect this not only in the absence of other graces; but in the presence of their contrary corruptions: and the similitude which wee bring to illustrate our assertion, would confirme that of the aduersaries. Tis the eye only sees, say our men: yet the eare is in the head too. Yea, reply they, But the eye could see well notwithstanding the eare were deafe. Tis the heat only of the fire or Sunne that warmes, though there bee light ioyned with it. True say they, but if there were no light, yet if heat remained, it would warme for all that: as the heat of an Ouen, or of Hell, burnes, though it shine not. Thou holdest in thy hands

*ad capt. antid.
contra Trid. Seff.
6 cap. II.*

hands many seeds (tis the old cōparison of *Luther* on the 15
of *Gen.*) I enquire not what tis together but what is the ver-
tue of each one single. Yea, reply our aduersaries, thats a ve-
ry needless question indeed. For if among them many seeds
there be some one that hath such soueraigne vertue ; that it
alone can cure all diseases , then tis no matter whether thou
haue many or few , or none at all of any other sort in thy
hand. Thou haft that which by its owne verture without o-
ther ingredients will worke the Cure , nor haue we ought to
make answere in this case; if, as the eye sees , heat warmes,
seeds and other simples doe cure by their owne proper ver-
tue: so faith alone by its owne efficacy did sanctifie vs. But
there is the Error. Faith workes not in our sanctification or
justification by any such inward power and vertue of its
owne , from whence these effects should properly follow.
For in sanctification faith, as we haue seene, is part of that in-
herent righteousness which the holy Ghost hath wrought
in the regenerate: and tis opposed to the corruption of our
nature which stands in Infidelity , Faith sanctifies not as a
cause, but as a part of infused grace : and such a part as goes
not alone, but accompanied with all other graces , as Loue,
Feare, Zeale, Hope, Repentance, &c. Inasmuch as mans re-
generation is not the infusion of one ; but of the habit of all
graces. Againe, 'tis not the Vertue of Faith that iustifies vs;
the grace of iustification is from God, hee works it : but tis
our faith applies it and makes it ours. The act of justificati-
on is Gods meere worke ; but our faith onely brings vs the
benefit and assurance of it. Iustification is an externall priui-
ledge which God bestowes on beleeuers, hauing therein re-
spect only to their faith, which grace onely hath peculiar re-
spect to the righteousness of Christ & the promise in him.
Wherby tis manifest that this argument is vaine. Faith a-

<sup>b Cap. 15. cius
dem lib. 1.</sup> lone is respected in our Iustification: therefore faith is or may be alone without other graces of *Iustification*. *Bellar-*
b would vndertake to proue that true faith may bee feuered from charity and other vertues: but wee haue heretofore spoken of that point: and shewed, that [true faith, yet without a forme:] [true faith, dead, and without a soule] be contradictions as vaine as [a true man without reason] [a true fire without heat.] We confess indeed that the faith of *Je-*
suites (the same with that of *Simon Magus*) may very well be without charity and all other sanctifying graces; a bare assent to the truth of Divine Revelations, because of Gods Authority. As tis in Diuels, so tis in Papists and other Hereticks. But wee deny that this is that which deserues the name of true faith: which whosoever hath, hee also hath eternall life. As it is, *Job. 6.47.*

3. Arg.

3. *Argument.* That which Scripture doth not affirme, that is false doctrine.

But the Scripture doth not affirme that we are justified by faith alone. *Ergo*, so to teach, is to teach false Doctrine.

Bellar. 16.

This Argument toucheth the quicke: and if the Minor can be proued, we must needs yeeld them the cause. For that the *jesuites* conceave that this is a plaine case: for where is there any one place in all the Bible, that faith, *Faith* alone justifies? They euuen laugh at the simplicity of the Hereticks (as they *Christen* vs) that glory they haue found out at last the word (*Onely*) in *Lue. 8.50.* in that speech of Christ, to the Ruler of the Synagogue, [*Feare, not, belieue only, and
þee shall be made whole.*]]

And much spoile they make themselues with *Luther*: that to helpe out this matter at a dead lift, by plaine fraud he foisted into the Text, in the 3. to the *Romans*, the word (*Only*)

(Onely.) When being caught with the fact , and required a reason: he made answere according to his modesty , (*Sic volo, sic iubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas.*) Tis true that Luther in his translation of the Bible into the Germane tongue: [Allein durch den glauben] read the 28.verse of the Chapter, thus (*We conclude that men are iustified without the workes of the Law: onely through faith.*) Which word only is not in the originall. Where in so doing, if he fulfill'd not the office of a faithfull Translator: yet hee did the part of a faithfull Paraphraſt , keeping the ſense exactly in that alteration of words. And if hee be not free from blame: yet of all men the Iefuites are moſt vnfit to reproue him, whose dealing in the corrupting of all ſort of writers , Divine and Humane , are long ſince notorious and infamous throughout Christendome.

What *Luthers* modesty was in anſwering thoſe that found fault with his Translation: we haue not to ſay. Onely thus much, that the impudent forgeries of this generation, witneſſe abundantly : that it is no rare thing for a Lyte to drop out of a Iefuites or Frier's penne. But be it , as it may be; Tis not *Luthers* Translatſon ; nor that place in the 8.of Luke, that our doctrine, [touching iuſtification by Faith alone] is founded vpon. We haue better proofes then theſe: as ſhall appeare vnto you in the confirmation of the Minor of this Syllogisme.

Whatſoever the Scriptures affirme ; that's true doctrine. But the Scriptures affirme, a man is iuſtified by Faith alone.

Therefore thus to teach , is to teach according to the word of wholesome doctrine.

Our Adverſaries demande proofe of the Minor. Wee alledge all thoſe places wherein the Scriptures witneſſe: that we are iuſtified by faith , without the workes of the Law.

They say then Workes are of two sorts.

- 1 Some goe before grace and faith, and are performed by the only strength of free-will : out of that knowledge of the Law, wherewnto men may attaine by the light of nature , or the bare Revelation of the Scriptures. These workes or this obedience vnto the Law, which a meer naturall man can perforne, is (say they) that *Righteousnesse* which the Scripture calls our own. By this kinde of *Righteousnesse* and *Workes*, they grant none is justified.
- 2 Some follow grace and faith : which are done by Mans freewill, excited and aided by the speciall helpe of Grace. Such obedience and righteousness is (say they) called the (*Righteousnesse of God*,) because it is wrought in vs of his gift and grace. And by this righteousness a man is justified.

By this inuention they turne of with a wet finger, all those Scriptures that we haue alleged. Wee are iustified [not by the workes of the Law] that is , by the obedience of the morall law , which a man may perforne without Gods Grace: But we are iustified by (*Faith of Christ*) that is , by that obedience of the morall Law , which a man may per-

^b Rom.3.27. forme by faith, and the helpe of Gods grace. ^b Boasting is excluded , saith the Apostle , by what law ? By the Law of workes, that is, by the law performed by the strength of nature ? Nay , for hee that performes the Law by his owne strength, hath cause to boast of it. By what Law then ? By the Law of Faith , that is , by faith which obtaines Gods grace to fulfill the morall Law. Now hee that obeys the Law by Gods helpe, hath no cause to boast. [^c Israell which followed the law of righteousness, could not attaine unto the law of righteousness.] Wherfore ? Because they sought it.

^c Rom.9.31.

32.
How knowes
Bellarmine
that? Bell.lib.

^d 15.19.

not

not by faith; that is, they sought not to performe the Law by Gods grace; (*But as by the workes of the law,*) that is, by their own strength: Thus *Paul* desiresto be found in Christ, (*not having his owne righteousnesse which is of the Law*) that is that righteousness he performed without Gods grace before his *Conversion*; But (*the righteousnesse of God which is by faith.*) i.e. That righteousnesse which hee performed in obeying the Law by Gods grace after his *Conuerison*. For confirmation of this distinction, and the interpretations thereon grounded, *Bellarmino* brings three reaasons to shew that when workes and faith are opposed: all workes of the Law are not excluded.

- 1 Its manifest; Faith is a worke: and that there is a Law of Faith as well as workes. If therefore; *Rom. 3.* all workes, and all Law be excluded from Iustification: then to be iustified by faith, were to bee iustified without faith.
- 2 Its plaine the Apostle, *Rom. 3.* intends to proue that neither the *Jewes* by the ^a naked obseruation of the Law of *Moses*: nor the *Gentiles* for their good workes before they were ^b conuerted to the faith of *Christ*, could obtaine rig hteousnesse from God.
- 3 The Apostle shewes *Rom. 4.4.* what workes hee excludes from Iustification, (*viz.*) such whereto wages is due, by debt not by grace. Now workes performed without Gods helpe deserue ^c reward (*ex Debito:*) ^{c Bell. cap. 19.} but workes performed by his helpe, deserue wages (*ex gratia*)

I doubt not but(notwithstanding these seeming reasons) the fore-named distinction and expositions of Scripture according thereto; appeare vnto you at the first sight, strange, vncouth, farre besides the intent of the *Holy Ghost*, in all those

H fore-

fore-reckoned passages of Scripture. Let vs examine it a little more narrowly : and yee shall quickly perceiue; that in this *Schoole distinction*, there is nothing but fraud and shifting. (*By workes done, by the strength of nature we are not iustified. By workes done with the helpe of grace we are iustified.*) This is the distinction: resolute it now into these termes which are more proper, and it runns thus. (*A man is not sanctified by those workes of the Morall Law which he doth without grace: but a man is sanctified by those workes of the Morall Law hee doth by grace.*) Both Sentences are squint eyed, and Looke quite awry from the Apostles ayme in this dispute touching Iustification. Is it his intent, *Rom. 3.* to proue that a sinner destitute of grace cannot bee made inherently holy by Morality, or outward workes of Piety? or thus. That a sinner cannot attaine to Sanctification by his owne strength: but hee must attaine to it by the gracie of God? Take a suruey of the Chapter, and follow the Apostles Argumentation. All both *Jewes* and *Gentiles* are vnder sinne, *verse 9.* therefore (*every mouth must be stopped*) and none can pleade innocency; (*and all the world must be guilty before God.*) & so liable to condemnation, *v.19* What followeth hence now? (*Therefore by the workes of the Law, shall no flesh be iustified in his sight. v.20.*)

How strange were this conclusion, taken in our aduersaries construction. *Ergo*, By obedience vnto the Morall Law done without grace no flesch can attaine sanctificatiō, in his sight. For neither doth the Apostle speake of sanctificatiō, but of absolution as is apparant; All are sinners against the Law, *Ergo*, by pleading innocency in the keeping of the Law, no man can be wholly sanctified, nor iustified, nor absolved from Blame in Gods sight. Nor yet will the reason immediatly annexed admit the glossie [*workes without Grace*] By the *workes*

workes of the law shall no flesh be iustified in his sight. Why [For by the law cometh the knowledge of sinne] that is, By the Law men are convinced of sinne, and declared not to bee innocent. Which reason is not worth a Rush, according to our aduersaries construction. Hee that without grace shall doe the workes of the law: hee is not thereby made holy. Why? Because by the law is the knowledge of sinne. The law thus obserued tells him hee is a sinner. In which reason there is no force, vnlesse it bee true on the other side. Hee that by the helpe of grace doth the workes of the law, is thereby sanctified: because the law thus kept tells him hee is not a sinner, which is most vntrue. In as much, as not only those which are destitute of grace; but those that haue grace also, and by the helpe thereof, keepe the Law in some measure, are by the Law notwithstanding convinced to bee sinners. The Apostle yet goes forward. (*If wee be not iustified by the workes of the law, by what then?*) Hee answeres, (*verse 21*) *But now is the righteousnesse of God made manifest without the law*) We are iustified by the righteousness of God: But what is that? It is (saith the distinction) that obedience to the law which wee performe by Gods grace. A glosse apparantly false. For the righteousness of God here is a righteousness without the law: But obedience to the law: though performed with grace, is a righteousness (*with*) the Law; because tis the righteousness of the Law. For 'tis all one, hee that obeys the Law by his owne strength: if he doe it ^d perfectly hee hath the righteousness ^{d As Adam.} of the law, and he that obeyeth it perfectly, by Gods grace, hath still the same righteousness of the law, and no other. For so the law be kept, it alters not the righteousness thereof, that wee keepe it by our owne strength, that we haue of ourselues, or anothers helpe that giues vs strength to doe it.

For then that strength which hee givis vs is our owne. Which point duely obserued cuts in funder the sincwes of this distinction; for tis cleare the Apostle distinguisheth the Righteousnesse of the Law and of God as different in their kindes: these make them to be one & the same thing, [Obedience to the morall law] but done by diuers helps; one by meere nature: the other by grace. This is most contrary to the scriptures, and specially to that excellent place Rom. 10. 3.4.&c. where the Apostle shewing the difference betweene the righteousnesse which is our owne or of the Law; and that which is the righteousnesse of God or faith: tells vs. The righteousnesse of the law is thus described [The man that doth these things shall live thereby:] but the righteousnesse of Faith speaketh on this wise [who soever belieueth on him (i. e. Christ) shall not bee ashamed.] Can any thing bee more plaine; then that the Apostle opposeth here [Doing of the law; & [Belieaving] in Christ: Not [doeing] the law by our owne strength, and doeing of the Law by [Gods grace.] These are *Iesuiticall* glosses that corrupt *Apostola-*
call Doctrine, and strangely pervert the worke of Christ in
our redemption, as if hec had done no more for vs but this
^h (*viz.*) procured that whereas wee could not liue by do-
ing of the law through our owne strength: God will now
aide vs by his grace, that wee may fulfill the Law, and by
that legall Righteousnesse obtaine *Iustification* and remis-
sion of saines. Vee abhorre such Doctrine, and doe reiect
as vaine and imaginary that distinction whence such absur-
dities necessarily follow; ^b more ^c might be said in confutati-
on thereof, were it needfull: but wee haue dwelt long vpon
this point, and tis time to hasten forward. By the way vn-
to the Iesuites arguments in the defence of this distinction
wee answere.

¶ Vee

a So Bellarmino
cap. 19 answe-
ring that
place, G d 2.

(If righteous-
nesse be by the
Law, then
Christ dyed in
vaine) saith:
Nay, seeing
we are iusti-
fied by faith:
and workes
following it,
Christ died to
purpose, that
God might
give vs grace
so to be iusti-
fied.

Workes with-
out grace doe
not iustifie.
Why? because
imperfect, or
because done
by natures
strength. Not
the latter: For
then Adam
was not iusti-
fied. Not the
former for so
all good
workes of the
best are im-
perfect.

1. Wee confess faith is a worke, and in doeing of it wee obey the Law, because (as Saint John speakes) *John.3.*
 23. [*This is Gods commandement, that wee beleue in the name of his sonne Iesus Christ,*] And therefore the Gospell is called [*The law of Faith.*] because the promise of grace in *Christ* is propounded with commandment that men beleue it. But now wee deny that *Faith* iustifies vs, as 'tis a worke which wee performe in obedience to this law: It iustifieth vs onely as the condition required of vs; and an instrument of embracing *Christs Righteousnesse*. Nor can the contrary be proved.

2. The Iesuites are mistaken in the scope of the Apostle *Rom. 3.* whose intent is not to shew the *Iew or gentile* could not attaine sanctification without Gods grace, by such obedience to the Law; as they could performe through the meere strength of naturall abilities. They affirme it strongly; but their proofes are weake, being manifestly confuted by the whole Field of the Apostles disputation, who clearely and plainly excludes both Iewes and Gentiles, from being iustified by the workes of the Law without making mention or giueing the least intimation, by what meanes these workes must be performed, whether without grace or by the helpe of grace. Yea it had beeene quite besides his purpose so to haue done. For the Apostles argument is cleare as the light; and strong as a threefold cord. All are sinners against the Law, therefore by obedience vnto the Law, (Let men performe which way they list or can, without grace or with grace) no man is in Gods sight pronounced innocent.

3. To the last argument out of *Rom. 4.4.* wee answere, The Apostle there proves; that the Faithfull, children of *Abraham*; are not iustified by workes. Because *Abraham*

the Father of the Faithfull was iustified by faith, and not by workes. Where wee affirme; That the Apostle excludeth all the workes of *Abraham* from his iustification: both such as he performed when he had no grace, and those hee did when he had grace. For those workes are excluded where-in *Abraham* might glory before men. Now *Abraham* might glory before Men as well in those workes which hee did by the helpe of Gods grace:as those which he did without it. Nay more in those: then in these. As in his obedient departure frow his owne Country at Gods command; his patient expectation of the promises; his ready willingness euē to offer his owne sonne out of Loue & Duty to God, his religious and iust demeaning of himselfe in all places of his abode. In those things *Abraham* had cause to glory before men, much more, then in such works as hee performed before his conuersion: when he serued other Gods beyond the Flood. Therefore wee conclude that *Abraham* was iustified; neither by such workes; as went before faith and grace in him: nor yet by such as followed after. This is most cleare by the 2o. v. [*If Abraham were iustified by workes, he had wherein to glory: but not with God.*] Admit here the Popish interpretation: and this speech of the Apostles will be false. Thus [*If Abraham were iustified by workes*] that is by such workes as hee performed without Gods gratiouſe helpe [*he hath wherein to glory*] viꝫ before men: but [*not with God.*] Nay, thats quite otherwife. For its euident. If a man be iuitified by obeying the law through his owne strength, he may boldly glory before God, as well as before men; ſeing in that caſe he is not beholding to God for his helpe. But according to our doctrine, the meaning of the Apostle is preſpicuous. *Abraham* might glory before men in those excellent workes of piety, which hee performed

formed after his *vocation*: and in mens sight he might bee iustified by them. But hee could not glory in them before God: nor yet be iustified by them in his sight. So then all workes whatsoeuer are excluded from *Abrahams iustification*: and nothing left but faith, which is imputed vnto him for righteousness; as it is v. 3. Whence it followes, That as *Abraham*: so all others are iustified without all merit, by Gods free grace and fauour. For so it followes, *verse 4. 5.*
 [Now unto him that worketh, the wages is not counted by fauour; but by debt: but to him that worketh not; but belieueth in him that iustifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for Righteousnesse.] These words runne cleare, till a Iesuite put his foot into the streme to raise vp the mudde. [To him that worketh] that is, which fulfilleth the righteousness of the Morall Law [the wages] of iustification and Life [is not counted by fauour: but by debt] for by the perfect righteousness of the Law; a Man deserues to be iustified and sauued. [But to him that worketh not] that hath not fulfilled the righteousness of the Law in doing all things; that are written therein: [But belieueth in him that iustifieth the ungodly] That is relyeth vpon Christ, who by his righteousness obtained absolution for him (that is) Righteousnesse in himselfe. [His faith is imputed for righteousness] that is. He by his faith obtaines iustification in Gods sight: not by merit of his owne, but Gods gratiouse acceptation of Christ's righteousness for his.

But here our aduersaries trouble the water by a false interpretation. [To him that worketh] that is, say they that fulfills the law by his owne strength. *Wages is not counted by fauour, but by debt,* but if he fulfill it by Gods grace, his wages is paid him by fauour, not of debt. Wherevnto wee reply: That this glossie is a plaine corruption of the Text.

For by workes in this fourth verse the Apostle vnderstands that kinde of workes whereof mention is made verse 2. By which *Abraham* was not iustified: and these as wee haue shewed were workes done by the helpe of grace not by the meere strength of nature. 2 And againe for the assertion it selfe, namely [*He that fulfills the morrall Law by the helpe of Gods graces is iustified, by fauour not by debt*] we say tis either a manifest falsehood or at best, an ambiguous speech. For tis one thing to bestow grace on a man to fulfill the Law: and tis an other thing to iustifie him; when hee hath fulfilled the Law. If God should giue strength to a man ex-~~a~~gry to fulfill the morrall Law that were indeed of his free fauour and grace: but when this man, that hath receiuied this strength shall come before God with the perfect righteouesesse of the Law, pleading that in every point hee had done what was required, God is bound in justice to pronounce him innocent, and of due debt to bestow on him the wages of eternall life. *Adams* case is not vnlike to such a man. For God gaue *Adam* what strength hee had: yet *Adam* fulfilling the Law by that strength, shuld haue merited Iustification and life. Therefore when the Apostle speaketh of all workes in the perfect fulfilling of the Law, he saith, that [*so him that workesh wages is not counted by fauour: but by debt:*] he speaketh exactly, and the *Iesuist* in excluding workes done by grace comment absurdly. Thus much touching the third point concerning mans iustification by faith alone, as also of the first generall head promised in the beginning. Namely, the condition required of vs vnto iustification (*viz.*) *Faith.*

SECT. 3.

SECT. 3. CHAP. I.

Of the righteousness whereby a man is justified before God: that it is not his owne inherent in himselfe: that in this life no man hath perfection of holinesse inherent in him.

I Proceed vnto the second Generall, of the matter *Sect. 3. C. I.* of our *Justification* where wee are to enquire what righteousness it is, for which a sinner is iustified in Gods sight. Justification and iustice are still coupled together; and some righteousness there must be, for which God pronounceth a man righteous: and for the sake whereof he forgiueth vnto him all his sinnes. Nor is a sinner iust before God because iustified: but he is therefore iustified because he is some way or other iust. The righteousness for which a man can bee iustified before God is of *heads*, necessity one of these two.

1 Either inherent in his owne person and done by himselfe.

2 Or inherent in the person of Christ: but imputed vnto him.

A man is iustified either by something in him and performed by him: or by something in another performed for him. The wisdome of Angells and men hath not beeene able to shew vnto vs any third meanes. For whereas it is affirmed by some that God might haue reconciled man kinde vnto himselfe by a free and absolute pardon of their sinnes without the intervention of any such righteousness, either in themselves or in *Christ*, whereby to procure it: to that wee say that God hath seene it good in this matter rather to follow his owne most wise countaines; then these mens foolish directions. Tis to no purpose now to dispute what God

I , , , might

might haue done, whether God by his absolute omnipotency could not haue freed men from Hell, by some other means without taking *satisfaction* for sinne from Christ: whether God ought not to haue the same priuiledge which we giue vnto any mortall king, freely to pardon a Rebell, & receaue him to fauour, without consideration of any goodnesse in him, or satisfaction made by him, or another for him? Or whether sinne doe make such a deepe wound in Gods iustice and honour, that hee cannot with the safegard of either passe by it without amends. Such questions as these are vaine and curious prosecuted by idle and vnthankfull men, who not acknowledging the riches of Gods wisdome and grace in that course of their redemption which God hath followed; would accuse God of indiscretion, for making much adoe about nothing, and teach him to haue gone a more compendious way to worke, then by sending his owne sonne to die for vs. These Criticisms vpon Gods glorious & wonderfull proceeding in mans redemp-
 tion, we leauie vnto *Socinus* and *Arminius* with their followers, it is our part *sapere ad sobrietatem*, and to understand what God hath; not tell him what he might or should haue done. According to which course of his now revealed will, we knowe that God hath declared his everlastynghatred against sinne: as that thing which most directly and immediatly opposeth the holinesse of his nature, and the iustice of his Commandements. Wee knowe that for this hatred which God beareth to sinne, no sinfull creature can be able to stand in his sight, without being consumed vp with the fire of his fierce wrath. And therefore before reconciliation it was needfull, *Satisfaction* should be made: where offence had beene giuen. Which seeing man could not effect by himselfe, God thought it good to prouide a Mediator, who should

► Lubbertus de
Christo servat,
lib. 1. cap. 1.

Pal. 55.
Heb.

should make peace betwene both. So that what ever may be imagined of possibility of other meanes to bring man to life: yet now we knowe that *sic oportuit*. *Thus Christ ought to suffer, Luc. 24. 26.* and that it [*Behoued him to bee like vs, that being a faithfull high Priest, he might make reconciliation for our Sinnen.*] *Heb. 2. 17.* Leauing then this new way to heauen neuer frequented, but by imagination; let vs follow the old waies of *Iustification* that the Scriptures haue discouered vnto vs: which are two and no more. Either by our owne *Righteousnesse* and *Workes*: or by the *Righteousnesse* and *Workes* of another (*viz.*) *Christ*. The former is that way whereby man might haue obtained *Iustification* and life, had he not beene a sinner. But now, man, that is a sinner, cannot be *Iustified and saved*: but onely in the latter way (*viz.*) *by the righteousness of Christ the Mediator.*

This Divine truth is of most infallible certainty and loueraigne consolation vnto the conscience of a sinner, as shall appeare in the proesse of our discourse, wherein wee shall first remoue [*our owne righteousness*,] that so in the second place we may [*establish the righteousness of Christ*] as the only matter of our justification in Gods sight.

By our owne *righteousnesse* wee vnderstand as the Apostle doth, *Rom. 10.* [*the righteousness of the law or of works*] which is twofold.

1. The fulfilling of the Law whether by the [*Habituall holinesse* of the heart: or by the [*Actuall Justice*] of good workes proceeding thence. For the law requires both, that the person be *Holy*, endued with all inward qualties of [*Purity and Justice*] and that the workes be *Holy* being performed for matter and all the *Circumstances according to the Commandement.*

2. The satisfying for the *Breach of the Law*. For he that

I 2 makes

makes full *satisfaction* to the law, which is broken, is afterward no debtor to the Law: but to be accounted *Iust* and no *Violater* thereof. Wee must now enquire touching these two: whether a man can be iustified by his owne obedience to the *Morall Law*. Secondly, whether he can be iustified by his owne *Satisfaction* for *Transgression* of the *morall law*. Concerning which two *Quares*: wee lay downe these two Conclusions which are to be made good.

- 1 1 *No man that is a sinner is iustified by his owne obedience to the morall law.*
- 2 2 *No man is iustified by his owne satisfaction for his Transgression.*

1. *Conclusio* For the former. It is the conclusion of the Apostle, Rom. 3.20. Therefore by the workes of the Law shall no flesh be *iustified in his sight*] which we prove by these Arguments.

2. *Arg.* The first shall bee that of the Apostle in the forenamed place which stands thus.

whofeuer is a transgressor of the morall law: he cannot be iustified by his obedience thereto.

But every man is a transgressor of the morall law. Ergo No man can be iustified by his obedience thereto.

The *Major* is an vndeniable *Principle* in reason. It being a thing impossible that a party accused as an offender should be absolved and pronounced innocent by pleading Obedience to that *Law* which he hath plainly disobeyed. Wherefore the Apostle takes this *Proposition* for granted in these words of his [*For by the law commeth the knowledge of Sinne*] v.20. That which convinceth vs to bee sinners: by that tis impossible we should be declared to bee righteous. That *Plea* will neuer quit vs; which proues vs guilty. Yea twere not only folly, but madnesse to alleadge that for ones *just excuse* which it selfe is his very fault whereof he is accused.

sed. The Major then is certaine.

The Minor is no lesse. (*viz.*) That every man is a transgressor of the morall law. If any sonne of Adam will deny this, his owne conscience will glue his tongue the lye: and the Scriptures will double it vpon him. Which hauing concluded [^a all vnder sinne] averre. That [^b If we, an Apostle not accepted] say we haue no sinne we deceiuie our selues and the truth is not in vs] Yea [^c If we say we haue nos sinned, we make God a lier, and his word is not in vs.] The conclusion then is infallible [*That by the obedience of the Morall law, no man shall be iustified (that is) quitted and pronounced innocent before Gods judgement seat.*] This Apostolicall argument vtterly overthrowes the pride of man in seeking for *Iustification* by the law: and it is of so cleere evidence, that the Adversaries of this doctrine cannot tell how to avoid it. But, forasmuch as many exceptions are taken, and shifftis fought out, for the further manifestation of the force hereof against gaine-layers of the truth: it wil be requisite to examine their evasions. Which wee shall doe in the next argument. Which is this.

2. whosoever hauing once broken the Law, can never after perfectly fulfill it: bee cannot bee iustified by his obedience thereto.

But man hauing once broken Gods Law can neuer after that perfectly fulfill it. Ergo, man cannot be iustified by his obedience of the Law.

The Major of this argument is framed vpon no other ground then the former, and opposed vnto that erroneous tenent of our Adversaries. [*That howsoeuer a man be a sinner against the law yet neuerthelesse afterward he may be iustified by his obedience of the Law. Because God for the time following gives him grace perfectly to fulfill it.*] Which opinion

^a Rom.3.9.^b Gal.3.22.^b 1.Ioh.1.8.^c Ver.10.

nion is directly contrary to the reason of the Apostle which is: *That once a sinner, and alwaies uncapable of Iustification by the Law: for how shoulde the law declare him innocent that hath, though but once transgressed against it.*] He that hath stollen in his youth, and euer after liued truely and iustly, can never quit himselfe in iudgement from the guilt and punishment of the euery by pleading, hee hath kept the law in his latter times. Obedience that followes after, iustifies not from the guilt that went before. As wee shall see more hereafter in the point of mans *satisfaction*. But let vs grant that the law though once broken, yet afterwards fulfilled would iustifie a man: we here defend the *Minor* [*That man having broken Gods law, can never afterwards perfectly fulfill it*] and so by that meanes also he is excluded from justification by it. This *Proposition* the *Romanists* will not yeeld to, without strong proofe: Let vs explaine it and confirme it. The *Proposition* may bee set downe in these termes [*No man whosoever can perfectly fulfill the morall law in this life*] Man here we consider in a twofold estate, 1 of Nature, 2 of Grace. Touching man in the estate of nature, it is agreed on both sides that the keeping of the law is vtterly and *absolutely impossible* vnto him. But concerning man regenerate and iustified, they of *Rome*, affirme he may keepe the law: we of the reformation granting that *absolutely* it is not *impossible* (for we will not say; but God might if he saw good, bestow such perfection of grace vpon a regenerate man, that afterwards he should liue without all Sinne, and be translated to heauen without death) yet, according to the order which God now holdeth in bringing Man to salvation; wee deny that there ever was or ever will bee any mortall man that hath or shall perfectly fulfill the *righteousnesse* of the morall law: This shall appearg vnto you, by parting the *righteousnesse*

nesse of the Law into its branches, whereby you may see what it is to fulfill the law, & how impossible it is so to doe.

The Righteousnesse required by the morall law is of two sorts.

1 *Habituall*, in the inherent holinesse of mans whole person, when such gratiouse qualities are fixed and planted in every faculty of soule and body: as doe dispose and incline the motions of both onely vnto that which is conformable to the righteousnesse of the law. That such righteousness is required by the law, is a plaine case and confessed; that which commands the good, or forbids the euill action, doth command the vertuous and forbid the vicious habit too. He that lookes for purity in the stremme, cannot but dislike poison in the fountaine: and God that commands vs to doe good, bids vs also to be holy; nor can wee doe the one, vnlesse we doe the other. And therefore the Apostle ioines both together. [The end of the Commandement is loue, (but where?) out of a pure heart] 1. Tim. 1.5.

Pure in heart
vndefiled in
the way.

2 *Actuall*, In the exercise of all good works enioyned by the Law, and forbearing the contrary euill workes. Whether these good or evill workes bee inward in that spirituall obedience which the law requires, (viz.) in the right ordering of all the motions of our soules, that every one of our Thoughts, Imaginations, purposes of our minde, and all the secret workings and Stirrings of our affections, bee altogether imployed vpon Piety and Charity, not so much as touching vpon any thing that is contrary to the loue of God, or our neighbour. Or, whether these good and euill workes be outward in the bodily obedience vnto the Law, in doing all and every externall duty of religion towards God: of Justice and Mercy towards man; and in leauing vndone the contrary.

Further

Further this *actual Righteousnesse* of the Law is to bee considered two waies:

- 1 As it respects all the Commandements, and so that righteousness is onely perfect, which fulfilſ all and every particular precept of the Law.
- 2 As it respects any one Commandement, or any one duty there in contained. And so we may call that righteousness perfect, which exactly performes any one point of the Law, though it faile in others.

So you ſee what is to be done of him that will perfectly fulfill the law: let vs now ſee whether any man can doe ſo, or no. We ſay no man can doe it; and we make it good in the confirmation of these three Propositions.

- 1 No man in this life hath perfection of grace and holinesſe inherent.
 - 2 No man in this life can fully obſerue all those good workes both inward and outward which the Law requires.
 - 3 No man in this life can performe any one particular good worke ſo exactly, that in every point it shall anſwere the rigor of the Law, and Gods ſeuere iudgment.
- 3 cap. 3.*

For the first we proue it by this argument.

I
Proposit. Where ſinfull corruption remaines in part, there inherent holinesſe is not perfect.

But in every man during this life there remaineth ſinfull corruption. Ergo, In no man is there during this life, perfect inherent holinesſe.

The *Maior* is without exception. For hee that is in part bad and ſinfull, tis not poſſible, he ſhould be totally good & holy.

The *minor* is moſt euident by Scripture and each mans experience and reaſon it ſelſe. *Gall. 5.17.* The Apostle deſcribes

cribes the combat that is betweene the flesh and the spirit, (that is) betweene corruption and grace , in a man regen-
erate. [*The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit a-
gainst the flesh: and these two are contrary one to the other, so
that yee cannot doe the same things that yee would.*] Who
can say that holinesse is perfect in that man, in whom cor-
ruption of nature, not onely troubleth, but hindreth grace
in its holy operation? Shall wee say this contention lasts
but for a while after a man is newly regenerate: but in suc-
cresse of time the spirit gets an absolute victory, corruption
being not only ouermastered; but also annibillated? If wee
say so, experience will accuse vs, and conscience will judge
vs to be lyars: Where is that man, & who is he named, that
can say, he findes no rebellion or distemper in his affections
. or desires, no disorder in any motion of his soule: but that
all within him is sweetly tuned vnto obedience , without
iarte and discord arising from corruption? Certainly that
humble confession of a most holy Apostle, may cause blush-
ing in any such *proud Iusticiary*. Had *Pant* the body of sinne
in him, and hast thou none? He fightes and wrestles [*against
the Law in his members, rebelling against the Law of his
mind.*] yea he is so checkt and mated by it, that [*he can nei-
ther doe the good hee would, nor avoide the euill hee would
not, when he would doe well, euill is still present with him.*] And so tedious is this toile vnto him ; that hee complaines
of it at the very heart, and cries out bitterly for helpe in this
conflict. Wherevpon though hee haue helpe from God
through Iesus Christ, yet hath hee not full deliuernce from
this inherent corruption, but is faine to conclude in this
pittifull manner, [*So then I^a my selfe in my minde serue the
Law of God : but in my flesh the Law of sinne*] Euen *Pant*
serues God in the better halfe of him: doe what he can, sinne
a *Avl O - iys.*
will

will haue a place in his heart, & a part of his seruice though he be vnwilling to yeeld it. If any will compare and prefferre himselfe to this holy man: hee may prooue himselfe prouder, but better then him he cannot. Tis arrogance for a *simple Frier* to claime perfection, when so great an *Apostle* disavowes it. He that will not acknowledge that corruption in himselfe, which *Paul* (in the name of all) confesseth in his owne person; tis not because such a one is more holy then the *Apc stle*: but because he is ignorant, and sees it not; or high-minded and scornes to bee knowne of it. Furthermore, reason eonfirms what scriptures and experience due witnessse; (*viz.*) that sinfull corruption will hang fast vpon vs vnto our dying day: for if wee suppose an vtter abolishment of sinne and corruption in our nature; it must needs follow, there will never bee any sinfulness at all in our workes and lives. Where the habit is perfect, the action is so too: and a sweet fountaine cannot send forth bitter waters. Wherfore seeing not the best of men can liue without manifold actuall sinns: It is apparent, that this ill fruit comes from a bad humor in the tree, and this defect of *actuall obedience*, comes from the imperfection of *habitual holinessse*. This is sufficient for iustification of the truth of our first proposition [*that inherent holinessse in this life, if not perfect;*] Because tis alwaies coupled with some sinfull corruption.

But here our aduersaries cry out with open mouth, that wee maintaine monstrous propositions. Namely^b *That there is no inherent holinessse in a man that is iustified, that after iustification, a man still remaines a sinner and unius.* That in *Iustification*, sinne is not abolished, but only covered with Christ's mantle. Thence they fall to their Rhetoricke, that all *Calvinists* are but painted Sepulchers faire without full

b8ccan. Tom. 3.
part 4. cap. 2.
Ques. 1. Q. 3.

full of rottennesse within. Like foolish virgins that haue no oyle of their owne. But thinke to bee supplied by that of other folkes. Like wolves in a Lambes skinne, which hides but takes not away their rauening and fierce nature. Like a leprous person in fine cloathes; that lookes to bee fauoured and embrased by his King, because he is well apparelléd. For this is (say they) to teach, That a man iustified is yet a sinner in himselfe. That corruption filthinesse & uncleannessesse remaine in him, when yet in Gods sight hee is accounted pure and cleane, because hee hath hid himselfe vnder the cloake of Christs rigeonsnesse. Whence also they tell vs it will follow, wee make Christs body monstrous, a holy, beautifull head ioyned to filthy leprous members. Christs marriage polluted; A most ho-ly & faire Bridegrome coupled to a foule deformed Spouse.

To this wee say. Truth is modest; yet shee will not bee outfaced with bigge words. Their eloquence hath flande-red; partly vs, partly the truth. Vs, in that they affirme wee deny all inherent righteouſneſſe in a person iustified, which is an impudent calumny. The truth, in condemning that for an error which is sacred verity taught vs by God in the Scriptures, (viz.) That a person iustified, is yet after that in himselfe in part sinfull. This wee still teach & maintaine for a truth, firme as the foundation of the earth, that cannot be shaken, namely, That although a Iustified person is by the grace of the Holy Ghost dwelling in him made inherently holy: yet this sanctity is not that perfect purity of the heart, which the law requires, because some degrees of impurity and corruption doe dwell in him till death. And therefore the most iustified person liuing, is yet in himselfe partly sinfull and vn-iust; but the sinfulnesse is pardoned vnto him in CHRIST.

Against this the Romish contend, labouring to proue, that in him that is iustified. Sinne doth not remaine at all:

but is utterly abolished. They proue it by such arguments as these.

I
c John. i. 29.
d Heb. 9. 28.
e Acts 3. 19.
El. τὸ ἄτελον
ἀποθύεις,
&c.
f Micha. 7. 19.

1. The Scriptures testifie, That Christ is the ^c lambe of God, that taketh away the sinnes of the world. That Hee was offered to take away the sinnes of many. That in repentance, our sinnes are ^c blotted out. That God will subdue our ini-
quities and ^f cast our sinnes into the bottome of the sea; in al-
lusion to the drowning of the *Ægyptians* in the red Sea. Wherefore if sinne be taken away, blotted out, drowned in the Sea, like the *Ægyptians*: then sure it is abolished, and remaines no longer.

2

2. They proue it from the properties which are ascribed to Sinne; as namely these.

a Ezek. 16. 25.
b Apoc. 1. 6.
c John. 1. 7.

1. Sinne is compared to spotts, stains and filthinesse: but from thence we are washed by the powring on of (*cleane a water*) vpon vs; and by the (*Blood of Christ.*)

c Col. 1. 13.
d Tit. 2. 14.
e Rom. 6. 18.
22.

2. Sinne is compared to bonds, fetters, and the prison, whereby wee are holden captiue vnder the power of *Satan*: Now Christ hath broken these chaines and opened these prison doores, hauing (*delivered vs c from the power of darkness*) and (*redeemed vs from all ini-
quity*) and (*made vs free from sinne to become the ser-
vants of Righteousesse.*)

3. Sinne is compared to sicknesse, diseases, and wounds. Now God is the best Phisition, the most skilfull Chir-
urgian: and where he vndertakes the cure, he doth his worke throughly: he cures all diseases, and each one perfectly. Hee doth not spread on a sicke man a faire Couerlid, or couer a festered wound with a faire cloath, as *Caluin* imaginis: but by a purgatiue potion he expells the disease, by a healing plastron he cures the

the wound. So that there is not left, nor corrupt matter, nor dangerous sore, that can proue deadly according to that Rom. 8.1. (*There is no condemnation to those that are in Christ Jesus.*) that is. That is there is no matter at all for which they deserue condemnation, as those expound.

4 Sinne is likned to death, nay it is the *Spirituall death* of the Soule. Now hee that is iustified is restored to *Spirituall Life*, and where life is there death is quite taken away, seeing a man cannot bee aliuie and dead both together. Wherfore the Apostle saith Rom. 6.

6. [*Our old man is crucified with him, that the body f ouers offinne might bee & destroyed, that hence forth wee on. might not serue sinne.*] and verse 11. (*W^eee are dead & g^eone unto sinne.*)

Hence they conclude:

If the filthinesse of sinne bee washed away, the chaines of sinne broken, the diseases and hurts of sinne healed, the Death of sin abolished: then it followes, that sin is quite extinguished, & remaines no more in those that are iustified.

3 They argue thus. If sinne remaine in those that are iustified and be onely couered: then God either knowes of the sinne or knowes it not. To say hee were ignorant of it were *blasphemy* (*all b^h things being naked and bare before his eyes.*) If he know it, then either he hates it or he hates it not. If he doth not hate it how doth the Scriptures say true that he is a (*God that hateth iniquity.*) If hee doth hate it in them certainly he must punish it: God cannot see a fault & hate a fault but he must also punish it too. If hee punish it, then he which is iustified shall yet be condemned which is absurd.

Vnto these arguments wee answere. Vnto the two former thus. When wee say *Sinne* remaines in a man regenerate &

K. 3. , , , Iustified

Iuſtified wee muſt diſtinguiſh the ambiguity of the word *Sinne*. In *Sinne*, to vſe that diſtincſion which is authenti-
call with our Aduersaries; There are three things.

1 *The offence of God*, which is the fault.

2 *The obligation unto eternall punishment*, which is
the guilt.

3 *The ſtaine or pollution of the ſoule*, (viz.) the inhe-
rent vitiouſe iſclination of it unto euill. From whence
the fault committed firſt iſſued, and which by com-
mitting of the fault is augmented. For euill once
committed leaues a further proneneſſe in the heart to
doe it againe. This wee call the *corruption of finne*.

Thus then we anſwer. *Sin* doth not remaine in thoſe that
are iuſtified, & regenerate in the two firſt respects, viz. of the
fault and the guilt, both which are taken away by the death
of *Christ*. But *Sin* doth remaine in the regenerate according
to the third respect, (viz.) the *vitiouſe quality and corrupti-
on* thereof, inherent in the ſoule: Wee ſhall explaine theſe
anſwers, and apply them to the *arguments*. Wee ſay
then; that the *fault and guilt of finne in the regenerate*, is ve-
terly abolished by the death of *Christ*. Which wee doe not
take in ſuch a ſenſe as this. That in a man regenerat there is
not at all any one fault or guilt to be found, for to ſay that a
man regenerate, when he ſins were neither faulty nor guilty,
were a groſſe vnuſtrut, ſeeing tis imposſible that man ſhould
finne, yet God not be offendēd; that man ſhould finne, and
yet not be guilty, and deferring eternall death. Wherefore
we confeſſe that in the holieſt of men, if they finne, ther's a
true fault, and God is displeased with it; there is also true
guilt, & for it they deserue to goe to hell. But yet this truth
also muſt be acknowledgēd withall, that all faultineſſe and
guiltineſſe are quite abolifhēd & taken away from them by
Christ

Christ, because that both are pardoned vnto them. God is offended; but yet they feele not the woefull effects of his indignation: because in Christ hee is graciously contented to be reconciled with them. Againe they haue deserued euerlasting death: but they come not to the paines thereof, because freed from the punishment by Christ's satisfaction. Thus then we vnderstand the first part of the answere. That the fault and guilt of sinne is vtterly abolished, that is, totally pardoned vnto the regenerate, by meanes of Christ, so that no finall eternall punishment shall befall them therefore. The other part. That sinne (*in the vitiuous quality and corruption if it remaines in men iustified*) wee vnderstand with this necessary limitation, that it remaines in them not in its power and strength: but in its being and life. It hath *vitem*: but not *Regnum*. It raignes where there is no Grace at all: but it liues euuen where grace is. Which though it mightily abate the power of it: it cannot vtterly destroy its being. Hence now its easy to vnty the *Argumens*. Sinne is taken away, blotted out, drowned in the bottome of the sea, in regard of those mischievous effects which sinne would haue brought on vs: God is reconciled, the obligation to punishment cancelled; and all the power, force, and strength of sinne defeated; So that like the dead Egyptians they can no longer pursue the *Israclites* to annoy them, nor shall stand vs as an aduersary in iudgement to condemne vs. The *Guilt* of Sinne is washed away totally by the blood of Christ; the filthinesse of corrupted nature is in part by Degrees cleansed by the *Spirit of Christ* powred on vs in his sanctifying grace. The fetters and bonds of sinne, whereby wee were held in bondage vnder condemnation these are quite broken asunder: but those chaines, whereby with Paul, Rom.7. (we are led captiue) to disobedience.

dience are some broken, all weakened. WEE are freed from the power of *Satan* and feare of Hell : but not wholly freed from sinne, whereby we are often captives against our will. Sinne is a sicknesse, and God is the Physitian; a wound, and God is the Chirurgeon, true: but he cures neither perfectly, yet correct that word. He cures our sicknesse and sores perfectly: but not suddainely, where he beginns the worke hee will finish it: but he will not doe all in a day . The cure begins and goes onward to perfection during this life: but tis
b Psal. 13. 3. neuer finished till after death. *He forgives b all our iniquity* and that's done entirely and totally [*and healeth all our infirmities:*] but this is by degrees not all at once. In which course God hath no cause to feare the censure of a Iesuite for vnskilfulness, nor stands hee in need of mans counsaile for prescription , nor mans helpe to hold his hand in working , if the cure goe on more slowly then our foolish hastiness thinkes fit. Thats fit and best what God thinkes so: and if wee count him faithfull and wise in his art; tis our duty to take his aduice: but saucy presumption to give him any. Lastly, where sinne is said to bee the (*Spirituall death of the soule*) and so life being restored to iustification death must needs be quite abolished: the weakenesse of this argument appears streight, if the *metaphoricall* terme be changed into *proper*. The death of sinne is either the Separation of all grace from the soule, or the Separation of God fauour from the soule. WEE are dead in trespasses and sinnes both waies : In regard that in the state of vnregeneration the Soule is vtterly desliture of all grace and goodnesse: and also because in that condition it is liable to eternall death. Now the death of sinne that is eternall death in the perpetuall losse of Gods fauour this is cleane taken away from him that's regenerate. Christ by his death hath purchased

to

to him life and immortality. But touching that other death (that is) the want of all inherent Grace in the Soule) Wee lay. That in regeneration Grace and Holinesse is restored to the Soule, yet not so perfectly as to abolish every degree of sinnefull corruption. Before regeneration the soule had no grace at all and so was vtterly dead but it followes not; that therefore in regeneration , it hath all grace giuen it in all perfection, and so made perfectly aliue: what euer harshnesse there is in the Metaphore, the plaine termes in this case are smooth enough. A man may be at once aliue and dead that is, at once a man may be partly holy , and partly sinfull. [Our old man is crucified with Christ] vpon whose crosse it receaued a deadly wound ; / because Christ by his sacrifice hath procured the ſending of the *Holy Ghost* into the hearts of the elect ; who by ſanctifying them, abclished their natu- ral corruptions by degrees. [That ſo the body of finne might be destroyed ,] that is, not preſently annihilated: ~~but alwaies~~, made of no force and strength , made vnable to worke ſtrongly in vs. [That henceforth we might not ſerue finne.] Though alwaies wee ſhould haue finne in vs. So are wee [dead to finne] not as if finne were vtterly dead in vs; or had no more working in vs , then it hath in a dead carafe : but because the guilt of finne is fully taken away , and the power of finne hath receiuied a deadly wound, doth bleed out ſome of its life now, and ſhall infallibly bleed out the laſt drop of its life hereafter.

Vnto the third Argument , wee anſwere thus , that the Hornes of thoſe *Dilemma's* be made of wood , and may be eaſily battered. We lay then that God ſees and knowes the ſinfull corruption which is in the regeneratē; for we cannot aſſent vnto that wilde and frantickē imagination of ſome; who haue troubled the quiet of ſome places in this land , by

L preaching

preaching that God doth not, nay cannot see any iniquity or matter of blame, in those that be in Christ Jesus. We beeleeue that nothing is hid from his eyes, nor bee our sins lesse visible to him then our graces. God knowes what sinnes his children commit, he iudgeth them to be faults, and such as deserue his infinite wrath. Yea, to goe further, as he sees the sinne of the regenerate: so hee hates it with a perfect hatred; it being impossible, that his pure eyes should behold impurity and loue it. But now what followes hence? If hee see it and hate it, then he cannot but punish it. True, that consequence is certaine. But whats next? If God punish that sin which is in the regenerate, how then is their sinne couered and their iniquities forgiuen? How doth hee account them iust, whom he knoweth and punishment for vniust? Here's a *sophisme*. He sees sinne, and hates sinne, and punishment sin of the regenerate: Therefore hee punishment it in, and vpon their owne persons. Thats a *non sequitur*. Hee punishment it, but tis in the person of Christ [*who hath troden the Wine-press*] of the fierce wrath of God conceiued against all sinfullnesse whatsoever in his *Elect*: by which meanes his hatred towards the sinne of the regenerate is fully satisfied, and also his loue towards their persons procured. Hee graciously pasleth by their iniquity, pardoning vnto them what hee hates, and hath punished in Christ: in which respect he may be truely said not to see that sinne in them which he will never punish in them, and to couer that sinne which shall never be laid open in judgement against them.

C H A P. II.

No man can perfectly fulfill the Law in performing all such workes, both inward and outward, as each commandement requires, against which truth Popish Obiections are answered.

 And thus much touching the first Proposition & the first point wherein man falleth short of his obedience to the morall law, (viz.) in the imperfection of habituall inherent holynesse.

We goe on vnto the next Proposition, touching Mans actuall obedience vnto the whole Law. Where wee teach,

That no man can perfectly obey the law in performing all such workes, both inward & outward, as each commandement requires. 2 Proposit.

A man would thinke this point needed no other proove but only experiance. In all the Catalogue of the Saints, can you pricke out one that after regeneration, neuer committed sinne against the law? Wee shall kisse the ground hee treads on, if we knowe where that man haunts, who can assure vs that since his conversion hee neuer brake the Law. Shall we finde this perfection in a Monkes Cell, or in a Hermites Lodge, an Anachorites Mue, vnder a Cardinals Hat, or in the Popes Chaire? All these are Cages of vncleanness, not Temples wherein dwells undefiled sanctity. Neuer to sinne; thats a happynesse of Saints and Angels, with whom we shall hereafter enjoy it: but whilst we are mortall we can but wish for it. [*Thy law (saith David) is exceeding large.*] It compriseth in it not a few, but many and manifold duties. Good workes are by a kinde of *Popish Solacie* brought to *Psal. 119. 96.*

a short summe *Prayer, Fasting, and Almes deeds.* These are eminent among the rest: but not the hundredth part of the whole number. There is besides a world of duties enjoyned, and as many sinnes forbidden: each Commandement hath its severall Ranks, every duty its manifold circumstances; to reckon vp all, were a busynesse which the wit of the subtlest Iesuite, or the profoundest Divine could hardly master. To performe them is a taske, which is beyond the strength of the holiest man, who in finding it a great difficulty to doe any one well, would forthwith iudge the performance of so many an impossibility. But if this suffice not; wee haue expresse Scriptures to proue that no man doth actually obey, the law in all points. Such places are these.

- 1 (1) *1. Kings 8.46. There is no man that sinneth not.*
- 2 (2) *Eccles. 7.20. For there is not a iust man upon earth that doth good and sinneth not.*
- 3 (3) *James 3.2. In many things we offend all.*
- 4 (4) *1. John. 1.8. If we say that we haue no sinne, wee deceiue our selves, and the truth is not in vs.*

Whence we conclude, that [*de facto*] neuer any did keepe the law: but brake it in some, yea, in many things. And therefore we say that the dispute of our Aduersaries, touching the possibility of keeping the law, vanishes to nothing. For seeing no man hath, or will ever actually keepe it (as the Scriptures witness) to what end serues all the quarrelling and dispute about the *possibility of keeping it*. Noe man shal be iustified by the law, because he hath a power to keepe it if he list: but because hee hath actually kept it. Whence it is manifest that the reply of our aduersaries is ridiculous. No man indeed doth keepe it: but yet they may if they will. For 1. What is that to iustification? Can a man thats regenerate be iustified by his obedience of the law, when yet after his regeneration

generation he doth not keepe it? 2. And againe, How know these men that there was, or is, such a power in the Saints to keepe the law, when yet the world never saw it brought into Act? Is it not more probable that what neuert was, nor will be done, never could nor can be done? Were they all idle, and did not doe their best indeauour? Tis true, none doth so much good as hee should and might: but yet tis a sharpe censure to say that none would put themselves forward to the vtmost of their might. What shall be said of St Paul (*Phil.3.12.*) Hee confesseth that himselfe was not yet perfect: but that he sought after it. How? negligently? No, with great diligence and intention. He followed after. [Διδωτος] v.12. and that eagerly, *Reaching forth to catch the things that were before his eyes in multitudine* v.13. And *pressing towards the marke, καὶ σκοτεῖσθαι*, v.14. Here was diligence, & we cannot say that St Paul did not doe his best. Did Paul then fulfill the Law? It seemes so, for here we see he was willing, and in another place Bellarmine tells vs hee *Lib.4.cap.20.* was able, for so wee haue it, *Phil. 4. 13. I can doe all things through Christ that strengtheneth me:* that is, fulfill the moral law by the grace of Christ. Now if he were willing and able then certainly he kept it. Nay tis certaine he did not keep it. Witnesse the testimony of himselfe. *I doe not the good things which I would: but the euill which I would not, that doe I,* *Rom. 7.19.* Where is the fault then? In the Apostles will? No, tis plaine he would haue done it. Was then in his ability? Yea, this was it. To will was present with him: but hee found no meanes to performe that which is good, *verse 18.*

The Jesuite then abuseth vs with a false exposition of that place to the *Philippians* interpreting it of the Apostles abi-
lity to performe the morall law, which himselfe meant con-

cerning that strength wherewith Christ enabled him vnto contentation and patience in all conditions whatsoeuer. Paul was able to beare all afflictions patiently, to vse prosperity soberly: but to fulfill the Law in all things perfectly hee was not able. And if he were not, who is? WEE conclude that the actuall obedience of the morall law in fulfilling all the commandements exactly, is impossible to a regenerate man in this life. Let vs now take a short survey of our aduersaries Arguments whereby they would proue that actuall obedience to the whole law is not only possible: but also very easie to the regenerate and iustified. They are thofe.

Bet. I. 4 de Inf.
cap. I. 10. 21.
12. 13.
Bocan. tom. 2.
tract. 4 cap. 4.
quest. 1.
‘*βαροῖς.*

I *That burden which is light may bee carried without shrinking under it, that yoake which is easie, is worne without paine; those Commandements which are not burdensome, may be obserued without difficultie. But such is the morall law. [My yoake is easie and my burden light] Mat. XI. 30. [This is the loue of God that ye keepe his Commandements, and his Commandements are not grievous.] I. Joh. 5. 3. Ergo, The Morall Law may be easily obserued.*

To this we answere, that the place of *Matthew* is to bee understood not of the morall law: but of the yoake and burden of the crosse and afflictions which every one must beare, that will follow Christ and obey the Gospell. To those that are wearied and laden with the crosse, Christ speakes by way of consolation, telling them whether to resort for help. (*Come to me and I will give you rest*) that is comfort and deliuerance. 2 Then hee perswades them to patience vnder their affliction. [*Take up my yoake upon you*] and beare it chearefully, which his perswasion he strengthens with three arguments. 1 From his owne example. [*Learne of mee*] to doe and suffer as I doe, enduring so many persecutions and afflictions

afflictions with all meekeſſe and patience. *For I am meeke and lowly in heart*, quietly bearing all wrongs and indignities from man without murmuring against God , repining against man, ſeeking revenge at their hands that haue vniuſtly persecuted me. 2 From the ſuccesse of this patient enduring according to Chriſts example. *And yee ſhall finde rest unto your ſoules*; comfort in affliction , ſeaonable deliu-erance from affliction. 3 From the nature of ſuch crosses. *For my yoake is eafe, &c.* Though they be yoakes and bur-dens which for the preſent ſeeme grieuous : yet they bee eaſie, they bee light, because Chriſts yoake and Chriſts burden, which he laies on all his true Disciples that follow him , and which he will give them ſtrength to ſupport and beare out with cheerefulneſſe. This ſeemes the moſt naturall interpretation of this place , and it is moſt agreeable to the twelfth Chapter to the *Hebreues*. Where the like arguments are uſed to comfort the godly in ſuch afflictions , as follow the profeſſion of the Goſpell. But yet if wee vnderſtand it of the yoake and burden of the Law: Wee anſwere to it, and that place in *John*, that the Commandements of God are not grieuous to the Regenerate ; not because they can perfectly and eaſily fulfill them: but because that which made them in-tollerable and vnsuppor-table vnto them, is now taken away. Whatſt that? The rigor of the law in requiring of every man exact obedience , vnder paine of the curse of eternall death. Here was the vneafineſſe of the yoake which pinched man in his ſinfull ſtate ; this was the waight of the burden , vnder which every man out of Chriſt muſt needs bee crushed and ſinke downe to hell. Now Chriſt hauing fulfilled the Law, and ſatiſfied for all our transgrefſions thereof, hath made this yoake eaſie for the necks , and this burden light vpon the ſhoulders of the regenera-te; because though they bee tyed to

to obey; yet not vpon those seuere termes of being eternally accursed, if they at any time disobey. Now they are assured their hearty obedience shall be accepted, to farre as they are able to performe it; and where they faile they shall bee mercifully pardoned. Which is a singular encouragement of a Christian heart, to shew all willing and cheerefull endeavour in obeying Gods Commandements, whereby he may give good proofe of his vnfained loue vnto God himselfe.

2 Againe we awnser that this vneasinesse & burdensomness of the *Morall Law*, is to bee taken in regard of the enmity and opposition which a carnall man beares vnto the obedience thereof. Vnto a naturall man it is the greatest toyle and wearisomnesse in the world, for him to bee made to drawe in this yoake. For him to bridle his desires; to checke his disordered affections; to restraine himselfe of his pleasures; to be tied to the exercise of *Religion*; to haue a lawlesse minde brought in subiection to a strict Law: Oh what a weariness is it, how he snuffes at it? Hee chases and sweats vnder such a burden, more then vnder the waight of ten talents of led. But now vnto a heart sanctified by grace, all such obedience becomes sweet, pleasant, and delightfull. The heart now loues the holiness of the Law; it ^b delighteth in the Law; takes contentment in ^c the obedience of it, and is full of singular affection and desire after it. Wher ce though it faile in many things through manifold infirmities and temptations: yet it ceaseth not in a willing, constant, & cheerefull endeauerour to performe all. Grace fighteth with many difficulties, and in the combate takes many a foyle: but yet at last the victory falls on her side. For (saith Saint John) ^d *He that is borne of God overcommeth the world.* So that *the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh, and the pride of life;* which he vnderstands by the world, (*1. John 4.16.*) prevale not

Mal. 3.13.

*overcomes
&c.*

^b Rom. 7. 21.

^c P. 119. per
volum.

1. Joh. 5. 4.

not against him, to turne him away from the holy commandement giuen vnto him. But he still obeyes cheerefully and sincerenly, though not euery way perfectly. This of the first Argument. The seeond is this.

- 3 If the hardest precepts of the Law may bee kept; then 2. Arg.
much more all the rest which are easier.
But the hardest precepts may be obserued, --- Ergo, the
rest also.

They proue the minor thus.

Three precepts there are, which are most hard as all confess.

1 *Thou shalt loue the Lord with all thy heart.*

2 *Thou shalt loue thy neighbour as thy selfe.*

3 *Thou shalt not couet.---- The tenth Commaude-
ment.*

*But now all these three commandements may bee kept
by the regenerate. Ergo the rest; and so the whole law.*

We deny the minor of the *Prosylogisme*; and say that those three precepts are not to be kept perfectly by any man in this life. They proue it in each particular.

1 *That a man in this life may loue God with all his
heart. This they proue.*

1 *By Scripture. Deut. 30.6. The Lord thy God will cir-
cumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to loue the Lord
thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soule, that thou
maiest live. This is a prediction or promise of that which was
heretofore, and is still accomplished in the regenerate, who
being sanctified and purified from sinne (a worke of Gods spi-
rit in the heart figured by externall circumcision of the flesh)
should loue God with all their hearts.*

2 *By example of Dauid, who saith of himselfe, Psal. 119.
10. With my whole heart haue I sought thee; and God also te-*

stifies

stifies of him: That he kept his commandements, and followed him with all his heart, so doe that only which was righteous in his eyes, 1 Kings 14.8. The like is recorded of Iosiah, 2 Kings 23.25. And like unto him was there no King before him that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soule, & with all his might according to all the Law of Moses: neither after him arose any like him. These men then loued God with all their hearts.

3 By reason; For to loue God with all the heart, carries one of these three sences. First, to loue him only, and nothing else, and so wee are not commanded to loue God with all our heart, because we must loue our neighbour too. 2 To loue him tanto conatu, quanto fieri potest; (that is) as much as may be. Nor is this commanded (faith Bezanus) and yet if it were, who would say twere impossible to loue God as much as one can. 3 To loue God above all (that is to preferre him before all creatures, before father and mother, as Christ bids Mat. 10.37. and as Abraham did before his onely sonne. Now this only is to loue God with all the heart, and thus, men may doe as appeareth bin the Martyrs and others, who left all for Gods loue.

Vnto these Arguments wee answeare. That it is not so easie a matter to loue God, with all the heart, as these imagine. ^{a L b. 4. c. 11.} ^a Bellarmine indeed makes a (but) at it. There is nothing required (faith hee) of vs: But to loue God with all the Heart. As if it were as easily done, as spoken: But wee belieue that in this (But) God hath set vp a white, which all the men in the world, may and must aime at: but none will shoothe so steadily as to hit it. Vnto the place of Deuteronomy, we say. God therein tell's vs what his gratioues worke is in circumcising, or sanctifying our hearts, & what our bounden duty is therupon (viz.) to loue him with all our hearts: the

the performance whereof wee must endeavour sincerely, though we cannot doe it perfectly. For the examples of *David* and *Iosiah*, who are said to follow the Lord with all their heart; there is nothing else meant thereby: but a sincere intent and endeavour in the generall to establish and maintaine Gods pure Religion in their kingdome free from corruption of *Idolatry*; as also for their owne particular conuerteration to liue vblameably. For *David*, tis a cleare case that not perfection; but sincerty is his commendations; whose many sinns recorded in the scriptures witnesse sufficiently that he had in his heart that corruption which many times turned the loue thereof from God to other things. How did hee loue god with all his heart when hee defiled *Vriahs* bed, shew *Vriahs* blood, intended to murder *Nabal*, andg'd away an honest mans lands to a fawning *Sycophant*, with such other faults. The *Prophet* himselfe in that place 119. *Psal.* witnesseth; as the vprightnesse of his heart [with my whole heart hane I sought thee:] so withall the weaknesse and corruption of it: against which he humbly craues Gods assistance in the very next words, [Let me not wander from thy commandements.] For *Iosiah*: tis plaine that this singular commendation is giuen him, because of his through reformatiōns of the most corrupt estate of religion, which was before his reigne. VWherein many Godly Kings before him had done some thing in redressing some abuses: but none went so farre in a zealous reformation of all, according to *Moses* Law. VWherefore the text saith, that there was no King before him like vnto him, which cannot bee meant absolutely of all, (for *David* is said to follow Gods will with all his heart; as well as *Iosiah*;) but since the time that religion began to be corrupted in the *Jewish Church*, there was none of all the Kings of *Iudah*, that was so faithfull as *Iosiah*.

ab; to restore all things to the first purity. Whence he hath the praise, that he turned vnto God more entirely, then any other King before or after him. But now from *Iosiahs* zeale in reformation to conclude, that in euery particular of his life he kept the Law perfectly, louing God with all his heart; is a consequence, that wants strength of connexion.

Vnto the reason from the meaning of the Law, we grant. That the first is not the meaning of it. But for the second, (*viz.*) *That to loue God with all the heart, is to loue him as much as may be.* The *Iesuite* hath no reason either to deny, that this is not commanded; or to affirme that if it were commanded, tis yet possible to doe it. Would any man say; except hee care not what hee say, that God doth not command vs to loue him as much as may bee? Or will it bee a truth from any mans tongue, to say, that he loues God with as great perfection as may bee? It cannot. Which appeares thus. Gods will is, that wee should loue him with all our hearts. Now Christ hath taught vs to pray. *Thy will be done earth as it is in Heauen.* Thence tis evident, wee on Earth are bound to fulfill the commandement of louing God: as the saints in heauen doe fulfill it. But now our Aduersaries themselues grant, that whilst we bee [*in via*] wee cannot loue God so much as wee shall doe [*in patria*] whence it followes, that no man can loue him so much as may be, and as he ought to doe: seeing no man hath his heart replenished with that measure of diuine loue, whereof his nature is capable, which either *Adam* had in his innocency; or the Saints haue in glory.

Touching the third sense of the words, wee grant indeed; that to loue God with all the heart, is to loue him super omnia, that is aboue all creatures. But the *Iesuites* take here but one part of true loue of God. Tis a singular part of diuine

uite loue, when the heart is so fixed on God: that neither the loue nor feare of any earthly thing can draw it from obeying of God. Which wee say, is a matter wherein every one failes in some kinde or other, more or leſſe, though in the end many Martyrs and other holy men, haue herein by faith ouercome the world. But this is not enough vnto perfect loue, to preferre God before all temporall paines and pleasures, profits or discommodities. He loues God with all his heart, not only who loues him aboue all, but also obeies God in all. *This is the loue of God that wee keepe his commandements.* Hee that for Gods loue will not obey Gods Law: hee loues his sinnes more then God. Offend but in the least thing, ther's presently want of loue: for he that will not doe as God bids him then, is voide of that loue which moues him to obey at other times. *Hee then that keepeth Gods word, in him is the loue of God perfect indeed.*-- *ἀληθὴς τέλειος τραβελας*, 1 John 2. 5. Perfect obedience and perfect loue are inseparable. Now seeing the former cannot be found in mortall men: wee cannot in them ſeeke for the latter. And therefore this commandement [Loue God aboue all things] cannot be kept in this life.

2 *That a man may loue his neighbour as himselfe.* For which purpose they turne vs vnto Rom. 13. 8. *Hee that loueth another hath fulfilled the law.* Because the law is comprehended in this ſaying, *Thou ſhalt loue thy neighbour as thy ſelfe*, v. 9. & loue doth not euill to his neighbour: therefore is loue the fulfilling of the law, v. 10. *And they bid vs looke Gal. 5. 14.* Where wee read, *For all the Law is fulfilled in one word: Thou ſhalt loue thy neighbour as thy ſelfe.*

Hereto we answere. That ther's in theſe places, nothing that needs anſwering. Wee grant, that the loue of our

neighbour as of our selues, is the fulfilling of the Law; that is, of the second table of the law, touching our duty vnto man, & so much these places witnesse, commanding vs also so to doe. But now how doe our aduersaries prooue out of these places that men can perfectly obserue this Law. Wee yeld the regenerate loue their neighbours as them-selues: but that *perfection of loue*, which in every point fulfills the Law, doing our neighbour no hurt, but all good, in all our thoughts, words and deeds; this wee cannot graue them, vnlesse vpon better proofes. Let vs goe to the tenth Commandement, which they say may be kept, that is,

- 3 : *Thou shalt not couet. This tenth commandement of the Decalogue, is (say they) possible to be fulfilled by a Regenerate man. For three things must be obserued, touching this concupisence, or coveting forbidden in the tenth commandement.*
- 1 : *The vicious pronemesse and inclination of nature vnto bad desires, which is styled concupisence in actu primo. As to haue a theevish minde.*
- 2 : *The inordinat motions of the heart immediatly arising from that corrupt disposition, which prevent reason, and goe before consent; as to desire another mans money: but sodenly vanishest of it selfe, or upon deliberation tis checked.*
- 3 : *The consent of the will, when either it takes immediate delight in such desires themselves; as speculatiue fornication, &c. or when it resolues to put in execution what the heart imagined; as to lay a plot to spoile another of his goods.*

The two former, the vicious disposition of nature, and the inordinate desire that goe before consent these bee no sins, (say the Romanists) and so not forbidden in the ten commandements. The last (viz.) Enill desires with

with consent, they be the very finnes which are forbiden in that commandement; whence they conclude that a regenerate man may avoide the breach of this commandement, ſeeing it is in the power of his will, whether he will conſent unto ſuch motions of the heart or no: & if he doe not conſent, then he finnes not.

Herevnto we anſwer. That whereas they of Rome teach, that the *Habitual vitiouſneſſe* of nature and the *disorderly motions* of the heart which goe before conſent, are no ſins: they therein erre grossely againſt Scriptures and found reaſon. Tis the gift of these men alwaies to iudge flatteringly and fauourably on natures ſide: they conſept to themſelues a God in Heauen like their God in Rome, *Facilem Deum*, one that will winke at ſmall faults, and graunt *Indulgences* by the dozen. Looke what they iudge a ſmall matter God muſt be of their minde: or elſe they are not pleased. His loue muſt ſit their humors; what they thiſke they can doe; that God ſhall haue leauie to command or forbide: but if otherwife they le tell him to his face, that hee is a foole or a Tyrant, to command them that, which now they cannot performe. For God (ſay they) to require of man a freedome from all *vitiouſ inclinations* and euill deſires, this were as mad an injunction, as for a maſter to command his ſeruant neuer to be hungry, or thirſty, hot or cold, and to threaten him, that he ſhould looke through a halter, in caſe it bee otherwife with him. This error we ſhall more conueniently ſpeak of in the refutation of common and generall exceptions, which they make againſt all thoſe prooſes, that doe demonſtrate the imposſibility of keeping the law, whereof this is one, that concupiſcence in the firſt and ſecond act is not ſinne. But now whereas they affirme that it is in a rege-
nerate mans power not to yeeld conſent to the motion of
finne

sinne, and that therefore he may fulfill the law which sayed (thou shalt not lust) we graunt them that the spirit may many times get the victory, ouermastring such vnruly motions of the heart: but this is not perpetuall. For who is there (except extreamely ignorant of grace and nature) but will confessse that many times these ~~παθήσεις τοῦ αἰωνὸς~~, *affections of sinne* as the Apostle calls them, doe worke in them so strongly, vpon such circumstances and aduantages, that they doe non only [*ἀριστερίας, cumbate and fight*] against the powers of grace, but also [*ἀνχυλαρκῶν vanquish them*] and euен lead a man regenerate captiue vnto the law or command of sinne. The Apostle confesseth so much of himselfe *Rom. 7. 23.* Who yet was able to doe as much as he that thinkes himselfe best. And therefore what euer power we may see me to haue not to yeeld consent, yet tis certaine that wee shall often faile in our practise.

This of the second argument touching the obseruation of the hardest precepts of the Law: The third follows.

3. Arg.

3 If a man may doe more then the law requires, hee may certainly doe as much.

But a man may doe more then the law requires. Ergo he may doe as much.

The minor Bellarmine prones by the example of the young man *Mat. 19.* who telling Christ that hee had obserued all the commandements and that from his youth, our Saviour bids him doe one thing more and then hee should be perfect. [If thou wilt be perfect, goe sell that thou hast and give to the poore and follow mee.] ver. 20. Now if the young man had done this, he had done more then the law required. In as much as whatsoeuer the law required he had obserued formerly. For doe you not beleue him that hee speake true? [all these things haue I obserued from my youth] verse.9. where-

Whereto we answere. That we doe not beleue the testimony of that vaine young man touching his owne *righteousnesse*. Who boasted of keeping the second Table in the outward duties thereof: when as yet he wanted inward charity towards his neighbour and loue towards God. Hee avouched that he had kept all perfectly fulfilling that Commandement [*Thou shalt loue thy neighbour as thy selfe:*] & therevpon is so bolde as to aske *Christ*. *What lacke I yet?* Christ to convince him of his pride and wants, puts him to the triall. If thou hast such perfect charity towards man; then certainly if God command thee to bestow, not a part, but all thy goods vpon the poore, vpon promise of better things to thy selfe: thy duty vnto God and singular charity to men, will make thee doe so. [*God then sell all that thou hast and give ^a to the poore.*] Vpon this speciall Commandement, this couetous minde shewes it selfe. Nay, 'tis plaine he loued not his neighbour, so well as his riches. Hee is neither so dutifull to God, nor charitable to the poore: as for either of their sakes, to part with his possessions. But, might he say, what? will not ordinary almes, or a little more then ordinary serue the turne? Must I giue away all. Indeed the Law requires that I be mercifull to the poore: but wheres any law that bids me sell my whole estate and distirbute to them that want? Christ laies an unnecessary burden vpon me, if I cannot be perfect without vndoing my selfe, I will content my selfe as I am, and not seeke after such perfection. Here a Papist will say he speake reason, seeing Christs speech was but a couniaile of more perfection, then the Law required. Now a man is not to be blamed if he chuse only to bee as perfect as the Law commands him, and so this young man was; if you'l beleue him or them. But the Scripture makes it plaine that he did evill in disobeying Christ; and,

N , , , that

^a *ab eis*
ausciss.
i.e. *de partim*
non omnia. Que
expofitio proba-
bilitas est, non in-
fallibilitus.

that if he had obeyed him in that particular, he had done no more then the law required at his hands. For obedience to every speciall Commandement is included in the generall. The Law indefinitely commands vs to giue almes : now if God by a speciall commandment limit how much we shall giue; whether halfe or all our estates, to obey such a particular precept is not to doe more then the general law requires vs. Such a particular commandment was this of Christ vnto the young man, wherein hee sets him a spell, according to that conceit of perfection which he had of himselfe: putting him to the practise of the highest duty which the law of liberality can possible require of a man (*viz.*) to part with all. This hee ought to haue done vpon Christs particular commandement; in not doing of it he brake the law, and proclaimed his heart to be full of couetousnesse, devoid of faith in God; and true charity towards his neighbour. From this place then our adversaries cannot proue , that this young man might haue done more then the Law required : or that we are bound at any time to doe as Christ bid him. Christs command was for his particular triall : not for cur imitatiōn. They that take it otherwise be a generation of men that professē beggary; and possesse kingdomes , who were willing enough to part with that little they had of their owne, that so they may liue the moe *largely* and *plentifully* vpon other mens. We goe forward to the next argument.

4. Arg:

4 If the Law were impossible to be kept it were no Law: for there is no law of things impossible. If God were more cruell and foolish then any Tyrant , to command vs to doe that which is impossible for vs to doe.

To this we answere , that the consequences were true if God had giuen a law which men never had strength to per forme. But now the law written in tables on Mount Sina,

was

was but a reviving and repetition of the same law , which was written in *Adams* heart ; the characters whereof were now defaced in his sinfull posterity. *Adam* had strength sufficient to fulfill it: which as he receaued for himselfe & vs so he lost it for both. Neuerthelesse though strength to obey be lost: yet the obligation to obedience remaines. Wee are no more discharged of our duties , because wee haue no strength to doe it: then a debtor is quitted of his bands because he wants mony to make payment. Nor is this cruelty or folly in God, that when he published this law vnto the *Israelites*, he did not qualifie the exactnesse thereof, fitting the precepts to their abilities, commanding them to doe iust as much as they could or would doe. Had God made a Law in that sort in fauour of mans sinfull nature : they might with better reason haue laid folly to his charge , ^afor bending the rule to the crookednesse of mans heart ; and not leuelling it according to the streightnesse of the rule. God was to set forth a law of liberty , that should not flatter but freely rebuke man of all vnrighteousnesse; ^a a perfect law containing in it a full description of *Holiness* and *Justice* , which man ought to haue and performe towards God and his neighbour: and in this case God had iust reasoun to haue respect vnto mans duty; not his ability, which once he had; but now had forfeited and lost.

^a Iam. 1.25.
P. 19.7.

The next argument is.

5 Every prayer made in Faith according to Gods will is heard and granted. But we pray that we may fulfill the Law perfectly. (For wee pray that wee may doe Gods will in earth, as it is in Heauen.)
Ergo God heares vs, and giues vs such grace that we can doe it.

Hereto we answere. That this prayer shewes vs what we

N 2 are

are bound to ; & what is our duty continually to endeouour. That wee may doe Gods will every day more perfectly, cheerfully and constantly, then other. And so farre God heares the faithfull prayers of his louing children , enabling them to better peformance , the longer they lue. But that such perfection of obedience is giuen to vs in this life; as the Saints enjoy in heauen, will not be granted by our aduersaries themselves. Wherefore they must also grant that that prayer is heard and granted vs by degrees. In this life wee attaine such perfection as Gods sees fit for vs : afterwards, that which is compleat.

6 Argum. 6 They proue by these Scriptures , that the Law may bee fulfilled. Gal. 5. The Apostle reckons vp the fruits of the spirit. Lone, ioy peace, &c. then he saith vers. 23. that against figh there is no law: [That is (saith Bellarm.) the law cannot accuse such men of sinne. So .1. John. 3.9. [Whosoeuer is borne of God, doth not commit sinne, for his seed remaineth in him ; and he cannot sinne because he is borne of God.] Ergo the regenerate cannot so much as breake the law.

^{2nd reader} We answere. That both these places are peruerted by false interpretations. Against such there is no law saith the Apostle. Against what? Such persons , or such graces? If it be meant of persons, (viz.) that such as haue the spirit , and bring forth the fruits of the spirit there mentioned against those there is no law: we must take it in the Apostles owne meaning, which he expresseth. vers. 18. [If yee be led by the spirit yee are not vnder law] How is that ? Are not the Regenerate vnder the law, that is vnder the obedience of the Law. Yes, we grant on both sides that grace frees vs not from subiection and obedience vnto Gods law. How then are they not vnder the law. Tis plaine. They are not vnder the

the curse and condemnation of the law , as those bee that walke in the flesh and doe the workes thereof , who therefore [shall not inherit the kingdome of God, v. 19.] and thats to be accursed. But such as walke in the spirit being regenerate and iustified , are not vnder the curse : and therefore though the law may and doth accuse them of sinne : yet the law is not so against them , as to bring condemnation vpon them(as it doth vpon other) from which in Christ they are freed. If the clause be vnderstood of the *Graces* of the Spirit , there reckoned vp, the sense is this. Against such workes there is no law forbidding them , as there is against workes of the flesh : these agreeable, those contrary to the law. But this makes nothing to our aduersaries purpose. For the place in John [*Hee that is borne of God doth not commit sinne yea cannot*] If our aduersaries exposition according to the very letter may stand good it will follow: That in the *regenerate* there is not only a possibility to keepe the law : but also an impossibility at any time to break it. But they easily see how absurd this position is , & that it being granted their doctrine of falling away from Grace lies flat in the dust: seeing Job faith expressly. *That a man regenerate (not only) doth not, but cannot sinne.* Therefore certainly he cannot fall from grace. Wherefore they helpe it out with a distinction. Hee cannot sinne, that is, *mortally*. He may sinne, that is, *venially*; and *veniall sinnes* may stand with grace and with perfect obedience of the law. This distinction is one of the rotten pillars of the *Romanish Church*; t'will come in fit place to bee examined hereafter: for the present , we say , He that sinnes *venially* (as they mince it) breakes the law ; and againe a man *Regenerate* may sinne *mortally*; which is true not onely according to their doctrine , who teach that a man may fall from the grace of *Regeneration* whch to doe is a *mortal* sinne:

finne: but much more according to the scriptures and experience which witnesse that Peter, David, Solomon, and many, yea all the Saints, haue at sometime or other their grievous falls; out of which, notwithstanding, by the grace of the *Holy Ghost*, abiding in them they recover themselves so that finally they fall not away.

The last Argument is from the examples of such men as haue fulfilled the Law.

7. Argum.

^b Gen. 17.1.

^c Gen. 6.9.

^d 1. King. 14.8

^e 2. King 13 25

^f 2. Chr. 15 17

^g Luke 1.6.

^h Ioh. 17.6.

ⁱ Phil. 3.15.

7 The Scriptures record that divers men haue been perfect in fulfilling the law in all things: as ^b Abraham,
^c Noah, ^d David, ^e Iosiah, ^f Asa, ^g Zacharie and Elizabeth, the ^h Apostles, and other ⁱ holy men.

Therefore the Law is at least possible to be kept by some.

Not to stand on particular examination of all the places of *Scripture*, which are alleaged for prooife of these examples; we answere briefly. That it is euery mans duty to aime at perfection in his obedience, according to Christ's Commandement, *Mat. 5.48. Be yee therefore perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect.* 2 That in this life there are many degrees of grace, which God bestowes diversly on divers men, according to his owne pleasure, and their greater or lesse diligence in the practise of *Holinesse*. So that comparatiuely some men may be said to be perfect, because farre more perfect then others, as the greatest starres be said to be of perfect light, because they shine brighter then those of lesser magnitude, though yet not so bright as the Sunne. But 3. we affirme that no man in this endeauour after perfection goes so farre, as for *inward holinesse* and *outward obedience* to answere the perfection of the law in all points. Even in these holy Saints which they bring for instance, the Scriptures haue recorded vnto vs their fallings, that in them at once we may see a patterne of *Holinesse* to be imitated, and

an

an example of humane infirmitie, to be admonished by. We haue ^a Abraham, sometimes misdoubting of Gods promise and protection, and helping himselfe by a ^b shift scarce war-
rantable. ^c Noah ouer-seene in drinke. ^d David breaking the sixth and seauenth Commandements one after another. ^e Iofiah running wilfully vpon a dangerous enterprise against Gods commandement. ^f Aſa relying on the king of Syria for helpe against the king of Israel, and not vpon the Lord, ^g and in a rage imprisoning the Prophets for reproving him; ^h and in his disease seeking not to the Lord : but to the ⁱ Phisitians. ^j Zacharie not giuing credence to the Angels message. The ^k Apostles all at a clap forsaking, or denying Christ. We cannot then in these Saints finde perfection in the full obedience to the Law ; amongst whose few actions registered by the holy Ghosts penne: we may read their sinnes together with their good works. And had the Scriptures beeне silent in that point : yet who could thence haue concluded, that these men or others had no faults , because no mention is made of them? It was Gods purpose to relate the most eminent, not every particular action of their liues; even Christ's story falls ^l short of such exactnesse.

^l Joh. 20.30.31

Wee conclude then notwithstanding these Arguments. Our second Proposition standeth firme and good (*viz.*) That no man in this life can ful fill the law in every duty both inward and outward: but that the iustest man on earth will fail in many things. So if he should seeke for Iustification by this his actual obedience to the law: he throwes himselfe vnder the curse of the Law. For cursed is every one that continueth not in [all] things, which are written in the booke of the Law to doe them , saith the ^m Apostle out of ⁿ Moses. ^m Gal. 3. 10. Which curse must needs light on those, that are of the ⁿ Dcut. 27. 26. workes of the Law, that is , seeke for iustification and life by the

the obediencie of the law, which yet they cannot in all things perfectly obey.'

CHAP. III.

No man in this life can performe any particular good worke, so exactly that in every point it shall answere the rigor of the Law, proued by conscience, Scriptures, reason, and Popish observations answered.

3 Propofit.

In Proced vnto the last Proposition, which concer-
neth Mans actuall obediencie to any one particular
precept of the Law. Wherein will appeare the
third imperfection of mans obediencie in fulfil-
ling of the Morall Law. We haue scene. That no man hath
perfect inherenth sanctity free from natures corruption. Againe,
That no man can performe perfect actuall obediencie
to all and every duty of the law without fayling in any one
point. And this much our adversaries will not much sticke
to yeeld vnto vs, and confesse. That there is no man, but
sinneth at some time or other; and that tis scarce possible to
avoid *veniall sinnes*, as they stile them. But then they deny
vitterly. That a man sinnes in every particular good worke;
though he cannot doe all perfectly, yet in some hee may ex-
actly fulfill the *Righteousnesse of the Law*, not missing in any
one circumstance. And therefore at least by that obediencie
hee may bee iustified. This opinion of theirs hath neither
truth in it felse: nor yet brings any benefit at all to their
maine purpose in prouing iustification by workes. For to
what end serueth it them to stand quatrelling for the perfe-
ction of our obediencie in some one or two good workes;
when yet we faile in many things besides? One thing well
done

done will not iustifie him that doth many things ill. For that of St James must bee a truth : *He that keepeth the whole Law, and yet faileth in one point, is guilty of all.* James 2. 10. Much more guilty is hee, that keepeth it in a few : and breakes it in many. But yet further, wee reiect this opinion also, as an errore: and wee teach on the contrary. That

No man in this life can performe any one particular good worke, so exactly; that in every point, it shall answer the rigour of the law, and the feuere tryall of Gods iudgement.

About this assertion our aduersaries raise much stirre & many foule slanders against vs, proclaiming vs to all the world, open enemies to all good works, that we bee Factors for the Kingdoime of darknes, promoting as much as in vs lyeth all licentiousnesse in evill courses, and taking off the courage and endeauour of Men after pious duties. For who will set himselfe (say they) to doe any good worke if the Protestants doctrine be true, that in doing of it he shall commit a mortall sinne? Who will pray, fast, and give almes, if when he doth these things he cannot but sinne? As good then it were to doe euill as to doe good: a man can but sin, and so hee shall let him doe his best. These slanderous incongruities fastned on vs, spring not out of our Doctrine rightly vnderstood: but out of froward and peruerse hearts, that will not see the truth. Such aspersions will easily bee wiped off, when after the confirmation of the truth wee shall make answeres to such obiections, as seeme to infringe it. We say then. That no man can performe any good work required in the Law with such exact obseruation of euery circumstance: that (were it examined by the rigour of the Law and Gods iustice) no fault at all can bee found in it. This wee prooue by conscience, by scriptures, by Reason.

First we here appeale vnto the *conscience* of man, the iudg-
ment whereof is to bee regarded; and wherewnto we dare
stand in this matter. Thou that boastest that in such & such
good workes; that thou hast not committed any sinne at
all. Darest thou indeed stand to it, and vpon these termes
appeare in Gods iudgement? Darest thou abide the strict-
nesse of this examination standing ready to iustifie thy selfe
against euery thing that hee can obiect: Wilt thou venture
thy selfe vpon this tryall euen in the best workes thou dost,
that God cannot with his most piercing eye of iustice spy a
fault in them, if hee number them, hee shall finde nothing
short? If he weigh them not one graine to light? Againe
let conscience speake, when thou hast prayed, fasted, giuen
almes, done any other excellent worke of *piety* and *charity*
in the deuouteſt, and most vnblameable manner thou thin-
kest possible. Thinkest thou verily, that in this case thou
needest not at all stand in need of Gods fauour, to passe by
thine infirmities, and that thou needest not euen in this be-
halfe to pray; *Lord forgive mee my trespasses?* What man
durſt say or thinke in any good worke: Lord in this parti-
cular I doe not desire thou shouldest bee mercifull vnto me?
Without doubt there is no man liuing vpon earth that shall
in serious consideration of the feuerity of Gods iudgement,
and the great infirmity of his owne nature, compare his
owne obedience with the feuerity of Gods iustice, but his
heart will presently shrinke within him, and his conscience
shunne this tryall; as much as euer *Adam* did Gods pre-
ſence. The thought of ſuch a ſtrict proceeding in iudgement,
would make the proudest heart to ſtoope and tremble,
the boldest face to gather blackneſſe, filling the foule
with an horrible feare in the expectation of that day; ſhould
the moſt innocent life, the moſt holy actions of men be there
Scanned.

scanned according to the rigour of iustice: not gratiouſly pit-tied, pardoned, & accepted according to that mercifull loue of God which conereth and paſſeth by multitudes of ſinnes. Twere arrogant pride in any man to vtter that ſpeech in a ſober temper; Whereinto Job breakes out in a paſſion, chaſed by the ſenſe of his miſerable tortures; and the foward diſputes. of his friends. ^a Oh (ſaiſt he) *that a man might* ^{a Job.16.21.}
pleade with God, as a man pleadeth with his neighbour. And againe, Lay ^b downe now, put me in a ſurety with thee, who ^{b Job.17.3.}
is he that will ſtrike hands with mee? And againe, Oh that ^c I knew where I might finde him, that I might come even to ^{c Job.23.3.4.5.}
his face, I would order my cauſe before him, and fill my mouth
with arguments. I would know the words which he would an-
ſwer mee, and understand what he would ſay unto mee. Speakes the man reaſon or is he beside himſelf? What? challenge God to diſpute with him, and hope to make his party good in the quarrell? This was Jobs infirmitie; Its our aduerſaries arrogancy, who dare ſet their foot againſt Gods; & bid him pry as narrowly as hee liſt into their good workeſ: they will maintaine the righteouſneſſe thereof againſt all that he can obieſt to proue the leaſt ſinfulneſſe. Job ſaw his folly: God grant that theſe may theirs; In a calmer temper, when coniſcience was not ouerclouded with griefe and anger: he reads vs a quite contrary leſſon. In the 9 Chapter of his booke. *How ſhould man bee iuft with God?* *If he contend with him he cannot anſWER him one of a thouſand,* v. 2. 3. And againe, hauiing reaſoned and queſtioned of Gods wiſdom and power, not to be queſtioned or refiſted by any. *How much leſſe ſhall I anſWER him* (ſaiſt hee) *& chufe out my words to reaſon with him? Whom though I were* righteous, yet would I not anſWER: but I would make ſuſplicatiōn to my iudge, v. 14. 15. Further, *If I would iuſtifie my ſelfe.*

First we here appeale vnto the *conscience* of man, the iudg-
ment whereof is to bee regarded; and wherevnto we dare
stand in this matter. Thou that boastest that in such & such
good works; that thou hast not committed any sinnes
all. Darest thou indeed stand to it, and vpon these termes
appeare in Gods iudgement? Darest thou abide the triall
nesse of this examination standing ready to iustifie thy selfe
against every thing that hee can object: Wilt thou venture
thy selfe vpon this tryall euuen in the best workes thou doſt.
that God cannot with his most piercing eye of iustice fy a
fault in them, if hee number them, hee shall finde nothing
short? If he weigh them not one graine to light? Again
let conscience speake, when thou hast prayed, fasted, giu-
almes, done any other excellent worke of *piety* and *char-
itie* in the deuoutest, and most vnblameable manner thou
keſt poſſible. Thinkest thou verily, that in this case
needſt not at all stand in need of Gods fauour, to par-
thine infirmities, and that thou needſt not euuen in thiſ
halfe to pray; *Lord forgiue mee my trespasses?* Wha-
durst ſay or thinke in any good worke: Lord in thiſ
particular I doe not desire thou ſhouldest bee mercifull vñ
Without doubt there is no man liuing vpon earth
in ſerious conſideration of the ſeueryty of Gods iudg-
owne obedience with the ſeueryty of Gods iug-
heart will preſently ſhrinke within him
as much
as he walketh

selfe, mine owne mouth will condemne mee, If I say I am perfect, it shall prooue mee peruerse. Though I were perfect yet would I not know my soule, I would dispise my life, v. 20. 21. And once more. If I wash my selfe with snow water, and make my hands never so cleane, yet shalt thou plunge mee in the ditch, and mine owne cloathes shall abhorre me. For he is not a man as I am that I shoulde answere him, and wee shoulde come together in judgement.

verse 30. 31. 32. See this holy Saint, who elsewhere stands peremptorily to the defence of his innocency and vprightnesse against that wrongfull imputation of hypocrisy which his friends charged him with all, telling them that till he die, he will not take away his innocency from himselfe, nor his heart shall not reprove him of his daies: yet when he sets himselfe before the Tribunall of Gods justice, he dares not stand out in his owne Iustification, but submits himselfe to the mercy of his iudge, with humble supplication for his fauour. These confessions of *Job* be not complements out of a fained and needlesse modesty: but the fruits of a conscience rightly informed and apprehensive of its owne sinfulnesse, & the feuere rigour of Gods iudgement. The serious meditation of which two particullars, wee commend vnto our aduersaries, and all other of their humour; that are apt to entertaine favourable & gentle opinions touching their sinns: and withall to nourish high conceits of their owne goodnesse. Whence they grow by degrees to thinke, that Gods judgement is like their owne foolish imaginations; and where they out of blindnesse or selfe-loue cannot see a fault: that there God himselfe can finde none, W^eee hardly see bearmes in our owne eyes: are wee then so skilfull to spy the smallest mote? Who can understand his faults (saith *David*) Wil^t thou answere him; Yes I doe? A secret fault may soone slip it, a deceitfull heart may

may in one circumstance goe beyond thy witt and watchfulnesse. Here then humility would doe well, and prayer for thy ignorances; for thy secret sinns; vnknowne to thy selfe as much as others. Here true modesty would haue her place, that thou preferre Gods wisedome and iudgement aboue thine owne, remembryng that he iudgeth not as man iudgeth: but sometimes otherwise then thou doest, accounting that abomination, which in thine own eyes is much set by; & alwaies more exactly then thou canst; seeing much euill in that where thou seest little, & some euill where thou think'st there is none. And therefore alwaies speake vnto thy selfe in those excellent words of Saint John; *if mine heart condemne (as in many things it doth) God is greater then my heart and knoweth all things.* *I John 3. 20.* God forbid then that in any thing I should presume to plead with him in my Iustification. *He is wise in heart and mighty in strength; who hath hardned himself against him and hath prospered,* *1ob 9.2.* Thus much touching our first argument, from the inward witnesse of the conscience. Which in the most innocent life, often in the most holy worke, drawes backe from Gods iudgement seat, and is afraid to put it selfe vpon the tryall of his feuere iustice.

Wee haue the Scriptures to witnesse vnto vs the same Truth. *Psal. 143. 1. 2. [Here my prayer O Lord giue eare vnto my supplication: in thy faithfulness answere mee and in thy righteousness.]* Here the prophet seemes to appeale to the *Justice* of God requiring his helpe vpon such termes, as if God out of pure iustice could not haue denied him. But tis nothing so. Tis the mercy of God the holy Prophet sues vnto. Answere me in thy faithfulness and righteousness, that is, in those gratiounes promises, wherein thou hast made mee to trust, wherevpon I doerely. *Thou art just*

& faithfull in keeping promise, be so to mee in my distresse, who according to thy promise seeke vnto thee for succour. Vnto this righteousnesse of God *David* presents himselfe, and his supplications; but before that strict & feuere Iustice of God he dares not stand, but in all submissiuenesse prayes in the next words. [*And enter not into judgement with thy seruant.*] He craues mercifull audience of his prayers: but deprecates the strict examination of his life and doings. He knew well that if God should deale with him vpon so hard termes; his owne innocency could neuer haue made his prayers acceptable (*For (faith he) in this shall no man living be iustified.*) The force of this place ^a Bel. seeks to decline by three poore miserable shifts. That *David* would not haue God enter into judgement with him to iudge him (*scilicet*) according to such things as hee had of himselfe: but according to such things as God had giuen him, that is, *Judge mee not according to that righteousness which I haue by nature: but according to that righteousness which thou hast giuen by thy grace.*) Which interpretation how ridiculous a phantasy it is, and quite besides the meaning of the Prophet, tis easly for any one to iudge by reading of that *Psalme. Bell.* therefore hath another string to his bow : but as rotten as the former.

^a Lib.4.c. 20.

*Non iudicare
ex his quae in
me habeo.*

2 That the place is meant of veniall sinns without which a Man cannot liue, and though they bee small faults : yet would it be no iniustice in God to punish them. So that the meaning is, [*Lord enter not into judgement,*] that is, Lord *I will not contend with thee I confesse myselfe a sinner and craue pardon,* Diuers small faults I haue committed not against the Law but besides the Law, and thou maiest easily pardon them. My case is not singular. I doe therein, but as other men doe, amongst whome, there is none so iust but some

some time failes and offends. And therefore doe not lay such faults to my charge. Men of corrupt conscience that thus sport with sinne and play with the Scriptures. The Jesuite must bring vs better proofes, then hee doth, else wee shall neuer beleue that *David* was a man of *Bellarmino* his mind touching *Veniall sinns*. That doctrine is part of the dregs of corrupted nature, maintained by *Popish Moabites*, who are settled on their *Lees*, infatuated by the Loue of sin, and flattering themselues in that *wickednesse* as little and light which God accounted worthy to bee hated. Wee acknowledge no *Veniall Sinns*: but such as deserue eternall death, which hereafter wee shall make good. And therefore if *David* would not that God should enter into iudgement with him, because of *Veniall sinns* that accompany his holiest practises, tis in effect, that which wee say; the difference is only in an *Epithete*. Wee say *David* prayed not to come into iudgement, because [*his best workes were sinfull*:] and *Bellarmino* addes, *because venially, or, pardonably sinfull*. Which aduantageth him not a iot. For let him mince it, how him list: tis manifest, that these were such sinnes, as for them *David* durst not venture his best workes to come vnto the Barre of Gods seuere iudgement. There is yet another devise.

That thirdly *David* speaks by comparison. (*viz.*) that though the righteousnesse of his workes were true, being absolutely considered: yet being compared with Gods Righteousnesse, it seemed to be *unrighteousnesse*. As a candle set in the sunne seems to haue no light: and a little light compared to a greater, seems darknesse. Whereto we answere that *David* here makes a confession of his owne sinfulness; not a comparison of his owne righteousnesse, with the righteousness of God. *He desires that God will*
not

not enter into iudgement with him; not because hee had not so much righteoufnesse as God, in comparison of whom it seemed little or nothing: but because hee was sinfull, and had not so much *Righteoufnesse* as hee should. Man may haue a *Righteoufnesse* of his owne ; infinite degrees , below the *Righteoufnesse* of God, which yet may passe the tryall of Gods iudgement without all reprove. As is manifest in the *Righteoufnesse* of *Adam* and *Christs Humanity* : both which though inferiour to Gods *Righteoufnesse*, were yet able to endure that strict examination. Wherfore wee are not accounted vnjust for that imperfection, because we haue lesse *Righteoufnesse* then our maker : But because wee haue not so much as wee ought to haue, according to the capacity of our nature wherein he made vs. But of this more hereafter. Let this serue for the clearing of this first place of Scripture, and the exceptions against it.

2The second place of Scripture, is that, *Isa. 64.6. But wee are all as an uncleane thing, and all our righteoufnesse is as filthy rags, and wee all doe fade as a leafe, and our iniquities like the wind have taken vs away.* This is the confession of the Church of God, submittting her selfe to him in the acknowledgement of her sinns, and the iustnesse of his anger against her. The confession is every way generall: both for Persons, not one excluded; *wee all* כָל־עָם are as an uncleane thing, and likewise for workes, none are excused from faultinesse. *All our righteoufnesse* (nay in the plurall) *all our righteoufnesse* כָל־צְדָקָתֵינוּ are as filthy rags. Hence they acknowledge that God is iustly angry with them, and that in his righteous displeasure, they are afflicted, consumed and brought into great aduersity, the glory of the Church, and state decaying more and more, like a fading leafe that falls, from the tree, and is driuen away with the wind.

winde; And we all doe fade as a leafe, and our iniquities like the winde haue taken vs away. Against this plaine acknowledgement of mans sinfullnesse in all his most righteous workes, the *lutes* except divers waies.

I That the Prophet speakes here in the person , not of the godly: but of the wicked, who make here this confession of their sinnes. And how proue they this? Thus. The Text saith. *Behold thou art wroth, for we haue finned.* Now God is not angry with the Godly : but with the wicked. Againe, the Text saith, *There is none that calleth upon thy name.* that is, none of the wicked persons , for the godly doe call on Gods name. This exception is manifestly refuted by the whole order of the Text, whereby it is apparent to any that hath but halfe an eye, that this recognition of sinne, & praier for mercy beginning at the 15. vers. of the 63. Chapter, to the end of the 64. Chapter, is made by the whole Church, and all the faithfull therein, confessing their owne faults, as well as others, and suing for relief, not only in behalfe of others, but of themſelves too. His reasons are worth nothing. God is not angry with the godly, saith Bellarmine, No? Then Peter is in an error, who saith, 1. Pet. 4. 17. 18. *The time is come that judgement must beginne at the house of God; and if it beginne at vs, what shall the end of them bee that obey not the Gospell of God; And if the righteous be scarcely saued; where shall the vngodly and sinner appear?* Heres iudgement on Gods houle, that is, on the righteous that obey the Gospell, as well as on the vngodly that obey it not. And so tis, when the godly sinne¹, they smart for it, in priuate afflictions, in publicke calamities, both waies they finde God is not well pleased with their ill doings. When a Church and a State is ruined, may not the most righteous take vp this confeffion. *Lord thou art angry for we haue finned.* Euen we by our
P sinnes

sinnes haue hastned and increased the publique miseries? I trow, none will deny it. Againe, the Text speakes of those that doe not call vpon Gods name. But the godly call vpon it, Ergo, tis not meant of them. True, they doe call vpon Gods name: but is this done alwaies with that diligence, with that zeale which God requires? How cometh it to passe then, that the godliest men are many times secure, slothfull, cold and carelesse in the dutiēs of Gods most holy worship? Yea, in the corrupt and declining times of the Church this happily is their fault chiefly, who themselues begin to freeze in so general a coldnesse of the season, loosing much of that seruency of Spirit which the Apostle requires of vs, as at all times: so then especially, when it should reviue and put heat into others, when their loue of religion begins to wax cold. At such times zeale in Gods seruice, vehemency in prayer, constancy in all religious exercises, resolute, but discreet forwardnes in the holy profession of religion is most commendable. But yet it so comes to passe, that even then much security and slacknesse ouercomes the godly, and whilst they should be a meanes to prevent a mischiefe, they hasten it vp on themselues and others.

And thus the Iewish Church here in this place confesseth that there were none that called on the name of the Lcrd, a carelesse negligence, & slacknesse in the seruice of God, was come vpon them, so that as it is in the next words, [*There was none that stirred up himself כִּי לְהַזֵּיק to take hold of God.*] None awaked and rouzed vp himselfe with diligent endeauour to apply himselfe to the worship of God, a fault wherewith God may iustly bee angry: as hee then was. This first exception then is frivolous. Others there be as idle.

2 That by [all] in this place is to be meant the greatest part

part; not all the *Iewes*, nor all their workes were sinfull; but the greatest part. For so the word [*All*] is taken in some places of Scripture: and therefore the *Iesuites* thinke, it must needs be taken so here.

3 That if it be meant of [*all*] simply: yet tis not to be vnderstood at all times. All the *People* and their works were naught and sinfull, when they were to be carried away captiue: but it followes not, that they were so at other times.

4 This must be restrained to the righteousnes which consists in obedience to the *Ceremoniall Law*. [*All our Righteousnesse*] that is, *all our Ceremoniall workes in Sacrifices, Observations of Sabbathes, New-mooones, Fasts and such like, [are as filthy clouts]* being done in that manier as we doe them (*viz.*) without *Faith and Obedience*. To these we say, that there would neuer bee an end, were a man bound punctually to refute every cauill, which an aduersary may frame out of his fancy-full imagination, and foward heart. Wee owe the Romanists no such credit: as to assent to any point of *Religion* vpon their bare affirmation. Wee can as confidently deny such exceptions as these, without yeelding the a refutation: as they doe boldly make them without bringing any proefe. And certainly most vaine and vngodly is that course which our aduersaries or any that tread in their steps doe hold in their disputations, about serious points of Christian doctrine: when being vrged with convincing Scriptures, they thinke they haue done the part of *Schollers*, and satisfied the *Consciencies* of others desirous of truth, if they can amase and stonny you a little with two or three interpretations and pretty exceptions, and so leaue you to chuse which you list. They will not tell you which they will stand to: but eu'en when their answers crosse one another, yet all shall downe, that if one helpe ^{not} another may, and altogether

altogether may vex you, when they cannot ſatisfie you. This quarrelſome humour of men, who ſeek not the truth in loue: but write to maintaine diſpute, is not the leaſt vexation of the ſpirit, and wearineſſe to the fleſh of man; as all thoſe will witneſſe, whoſe much reading hath lead them along into the perplexed mazes of Schoole-learning, whether *Divine* or *Humane*.

The third place of Scripture is, *Pſal. 130.3.* *If thou Lord ſhouldſt mark iniquities, O Lord! who ſhall ſtand?* This place is parallel to the former, wherein the holy Prophet defiſes God to be atteſtive to the voice of his ſupplications, craves this audience mereley of Gods fauour; not vpon any righ-teouneſſe or worth of his owne. As for that hee confeſſeth, That if God ſhould be ſtrict to obſerue wherein hee and all men doe amifle: neither himſelfe, nor any other could bee able to ſtand in his preſence. Whence hee flies from hiſiſſe, vnto his mercy. *But there is forgiueneſſe with thee that thou maift be feared.* verſ. 4. Presumption then it is, and arro-gant pride for any *Romanift* to lay, Lord if thou doe obſerue iniquities: yet I ſhall be able to ſtand. In ſuch and ſuch good workeſ, bee extreame to marke what is done amifle: I feare not the triall, nor will ſue to thy mercy.

From Scriptures we come to reaſon. Which is thus.

VVhereſoeuer there is *concupiſcence* and inordinate mo-tions of the heart, whereſoeuer there's a defect of charity towards God and man; VVhereſoeuer *veniall finnes* (as our aduersaries call them) are mingled with good workeſ: there the *best workeſ* of men are not free from ſome corrup-tions and ſinfulneſſe.

But in a man *Regenerate* there is *concupiſcence* and evill motions of the heart preſent with him, when he would doe good; there is a want of that meaſure of loue to God, & cha-ri-ty

rity to man, which he might and ought to haue, there also are besides many *veniall faults* that accompany his best workes.

Ergo, the workes of a man Regenerate are not every way good: but in part sinfull.

The *Minor* is cleere and confessed by our Aduersaries: especially for the two former circumſtances of *concupiſcence*, and *imperfection of charity*: and for *veniall finnes*, they also acknowledge it a very hard matter to avoid them in any good worke. Wherefore they are ^{a Bell.4.c.17.} driven in a desperate manner to deny the *Maior* and to avouch. That neither *concupiſcence*, nor *imperfection of Charity* to God or our Neighbour; nor yet *veniall finnes* mingled with good workes, doe at all impaire the goodnessse and perfect righteouſneſſe of our obedience to the Law; but that they are as good with those infirmities, as without them. Bad causes must be helpt out, by bold and desperate attempts; and so it fares with our aduersaries in this point. They will vterly deny that there is any thing euill in a man Regenerate: rather then bee forced to confesse there is any thing euill in the workes that he performes. The impudent vnreſonablenes of this their assertion, we ſhall shortly ſpeak of. In the meane we goe on vnto the conſideration of ſuch arguments, which are brought by our aduersaries to proue; That the good workes of men *Regenerat*, are truly & perfectly good, without all faulteouſneſſe in them. They proue it their.

I *First from the examples of Job and David. Of Job is Bell.11v.4. cap. 15.17.*
said. Job.1.22. In all this Job ſinned not, nor charged God foolishly, and chap. 2. verſe 10. In all this did not Job ſinne with his lippeſ. Againſt David: he is conſci- 15.17. Beccan.Tomez. tract 2. cap. 2. queſt 4. &c. 4. queſt 1. ou to himſelfe, of his owne innocence, and that no fault can be found in his doings, wherefore he prayes, Pſal.7.8 Judge.

Judge me, O Lord, according to my righteousness, and according to mine integrity that is in me. And after all this, Psal. 18. 23. 24. Hee professeth openly his innocency, and reward for it. I was, saith he, also upright before him, and I kept my ſelfe from mine iniquity. Therefore hath the Lord recompenced mee according to my righteousness, according to the cleannesse of my hands in his ſight. And Psal. 17. verf. 3. Hee declares how God had thoroughly tried him: and yet found him faultleſſe. Thou hast proued mine heart, thou hast viſited me in the night, thou hast tried mee, and yet ſhalt finde nothing: I am purpoſed, my mouth ſhall not tranſgreſſe. How then can any man ſay that Job and David ſinned mortally in their ſayings and doings: when God himſelfe witneſſeth for them that they doe not ſinne?

Hereto we anſwere. That we doe not lay ſinne vnto the charge of those holy men: nor doe we ſay they did ill, where the Scriptures witneſſe they did well. Job in that firſt Act of his tryall quitted himſelfe well, and ouercame the temptation. He ſinned not as afterwards he did, breaking forth into impatiency: & that is all the Scripture meant by that ſpeech *In all this Job ſinned not.* But whether Jobs patience were in this firſt conflict every way ſo vndeſcribable, that not the leaſt fault could be ſpied in it, in Gods ſeuere iudgement, is more then we dare affirme, or our Adverſaries will ever bee able to proue. For David, his innocent demeanour of himſelfe, in the time of Saules raigne was ſuch: that no imputatiōn of vnfaihfulneſſe or ambition could iuſtly be laid to his charge. Wherefore when Saules followers accufe him of treaſon againſt their Maſter: David appeals vnto God, deſiring him to deale with him according to his innocency in that behalfe. His owne conſcience, and God with his conſcience

ence, after triall made, acquit him from plotting and practising against *Saul*, as his Aduersaries said he did. Thence it followes that *David* did not offend in that kinde whereof his Aduersaries accused him. His heart was vpright; his life was innocent, neither his Aduersaries could make proofe, neither did his conscience accuse him, or God condemne him of these faults, that he was charged withall. Thus far *David* durst stand to Gods iudgement; that hee was innocent in those particular evills, whereof man had accused him: but it followes not therefore hee durst enter into iudgement with God: and plead, that God himselfe could finde no fault at all with him. He might haue many secret faults and imperfections euen in this most innocent passage of his life; which neither himselfe knewe, nor his enimies could come to the knowledge of: and therefore though he dare plead his righ-teousnesse before God, so farre as man can accuse him of vn-righteousnesse, yet hee dare not goe further to cleere himselfe against all that God may obiect against him. Hearc what himselfe saith in this case, *Psal. 139. 23. 24.* *Search me, O God, and knowe my heart, try mee and knowe my thoughts.* Speakes the Prophet this out of confidence, that God vpon search and triall, shall finde no evill in his heart & thoughts? No, but out of holy desire, that whatsoeuer evill is found in him may be amended. Hee knowes well that many things may be found faulty in him: and therefore hee stands not to iustifie himselfe: but onely sue for grace to redresse them; adding in the next words. *And see if there bee any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.*

2 They proue that the workes of men Regenerate are not sinfull by the *Scriptures* which call them *good workes*, & say that they are *pleasing unto God*. I. That they are *good*. [*Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good*]

good workes] Mat. 5.16. [Charge the rich that they doe good and be rich in good workes] 1.Tim. 6.18. [Wee are his workmanship created in Christ unto good workes] Eph. 2.10. [Why trouble yee the woman; for shee hath wrought a good worke upon me.] Mat. 26.10.2. That they are also pleasing vnto God is apparant by these places. Yee are made [an hol- ly Priesthood to offer vp spirituall sacrifices, acceptable to God by Iesus Christ] 1.Pet. 2.5. In the Epistle to the Philippians, The Apostle calleth their almes sent vnto him (an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing vnto God] Phil. 4.18. Againe. [To doe good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased] Heb. 13.16. Hence they argue. If the workes of men regenerate bee good and acceptable vnto God: then certainly the Protestants erre in their doctrine, teaching that the best workes of Men are sinfull for as much as sinne is neither good in it selfe, nor any way pleasing vnto God. Who is infinitely offended at all ini-
quity.

Herevnto wee answere. That this argument is nothing, but a froward and wilfull mistake of our doctrine. Wee teach, that the best workes of the best men are in part sinne-
full. They thereupon cry out that wee take away all good-
nesse from the workes of the Godly, and that wee account

a Perverting
Calvins words
Ne venum a
faulcis(exit)
opus quod si (in
se) censetur non
meretus iusti-
dem Calu. Inst.
L3.c.14. § 4.

them to be [*in se*. a i. e. Ex natura sua] damnable and mor-
tall sinnes. This is a foolish calumny of men that cannot
distinguish betweene the disease and the diseased body: but
straightway conclude that the whole body it selfe is no-
thing else, but a mere rotten ulcer, because it hath swellings
and sores in soime part of it. Wherfore to vnsold their
eyes in this point, they are to understand that wee make a
necessary & true distinction between *That which is sinne &*
that which is sinfull: teaching that the good workes of the
Regenerate

Regenerate be not ſinnes, though they be ſinfull. Wee ex-
plaine it thus. That is to be called *Sinne* in its owne nature,
which is the transgression of the law in doeing any act for-
bidden; or in leauing vndone any act commanded by the
Law. The omitting, or committing of any ſuch act is pro-
perly [^b in ſe & c. Naturā ſuā] a *finne*. Because it is direct-
ly and totally in the very substance of it againſt the Law.
As to pray to a false God, or neglect prayer to the true
God, are both of them ſinnes in their very proper natures:
because both are forbidden by the morall law. That wee
call *finnefull*, which is for the maine ſubſtance of the worke
conformable to the Law; but it failes and offendeth againſt
the law in ſome circumſtances required in the doeing of it,
when the thing is done which the Law commands, but not
Perfectly in every point as the Law commands it: ſuch a
worke: we ſay, is not a *finne*, though it bee ſinfull; there is
finne in it, but it is not all *finne*. This diſtincſion our Aduer-
ſaries cannot but admit of, as in the *workeſ of the Heathen*
and *Christians unregenerate*: ſo in the good workeſ of the
Regenerate themſelues. Wee and they confeſſe that the
morall vertueſ of the *Heathen* were good and commenda-
ble in the ſubſtance thereof: nor doe wee thiſke there is any
man ſo deuoide of reaſon, as to affirme that the *Inſtice, tem-
perance, Chriftiſty, Liberality* of a *Heathen*, are mere *vices*,
and *finneſ*. Wee all grant, they were *vertueſ*: but yet our
Aduerſaries themſelues cannot affirme, that they were euery
way vertuous, free from all ſpots and ſtaines of ^c *Vice*; ſeeing
they had neither faith & ſanctiſty from whence they ſprung;
nor the glory of God at which they aimed. Now as the ver-
tueſ of the naturall man, are in part vitious: ſo the *good*
workeſ of the Regenerate are in part ſinfull. To fast, to
pray to giue almes, with the like workeſ of *Piety* or *Mercy*,



wee

^{b Bell. I. 4 c. 17.}
erres in laying (opera bo-
na ex genere fi-
ne ex obieſto,
ſed mala ex cir-
cumſtanciis,
non ſunt bona
ſimpliciuerit: ſed
mala (ſc. ſimpli-
citer) quoniam
bonum non ex-
iſtet niſi ex cauſa
integra: ma-
lum vero ex
quolibet virtu)
And it is false
which he ad-
des that God
doth ſimply
condemne
(ſuſlo) almes-
deeds, &c. don-
with a bad in-
tention for
vainglory,
&c. God doth
not ſimply
condemne
the worke: but
them for the r-
ill doing of it.
^c Sunt vitia
non vicia.

we affirme and teach that they are *good workes*, good in their nature and vse: being such actions as the Law commands. Wee know none of our side so farre gone with paf-
fion, as to maintaine that a godly man sinnes because hee
fasts, prayes, and giues almes; as if those very acts were no-
thing but damnable sinne. Wee detest such frantick opinions;
and if any of our writers haue let slip such words, as
may giue occasion to our aduersaries, so to thinke of vs; we
doe not, nor are wee bound to iustifie euery hot and cho-
lericke speech, breathed out in eagernessee of disputation.
Good workes they bee, truly and verily *good*: but they are not
perfectly *good*. When a good man prayes he doth well:
but he neuer doth so well; but he may doe better. Nor dare
any man in the world auouch: that either the root whence
good actions come, is purged by perfect holinesse: or the
manner of doing them, is so exactly kept in a precise obser-
uation of every circumstance, or the end in doing them
Gods *glory*, and mans *good*, so sincerenly and truely aimed
at: that the *severity of Gods justice*, cannot finde any the least
failing in any of those things. This is all we teach touching
the *sinfulnesse of good workes*, and thus wee stand too, as a
most certaine truth. And wee say *That this sinfulnesse* ac-
companying our good workes, is sufficient to barre vs from
iustification by them. For wee deserue not reward for what
is well done, except all were well done. But neuerthelesse it
shall not hinder Gods gratiouse acceptation of our *good
workes*, who is well pleased with the obedience of his chil-
dren, so farre as it is good and holy: and when it failes, for
Christ's sake he mercifully pardoneth their trespasses. Thus
much of the second Argument. The third is from reason
grounded on scriptures.

3 *where there are (sufficientia principia rectae opera-
tionis)*

tionis) sufficient causes and meanes of well doeing: there a good worke may bee done without all fault--- But in a man regenerat, there are causes and meanes sufficient for well-doing ---- Ergo, H̄e may doe well, and not offend.

They proue the 3 minor thus. To the performance of any good worke, there is required nothing, but these things. Knowledge of what is to be done, will and power to doe it ---- But now a regenerate man hath all these. For first, his understanding is enlightened, so that hee can easily know what is good to bee done. Secondly, his will and affections are sanctified and aided by grace, to deſire and endeauour the performance of it. And thirdly, and lastly, hee hath power to put in practise what hee knowes & desires, there being no impediment inward, or outward that shoulde binder him --- Ergo, he may doe well and finne not.

Here wee desire them to shew vs how a man Regenerate is endued with such perfect abilities, as may helpe him: and quite rid him of all such impediments, as might hinder him in well doing.

This (say they) is done by the grace of ſanctification, giuen unto a Regenerate man, whereby he is freed from all contagion of ſinne: and ſuch incumbrances, as hinder him in well-doing. For by this grace giuen to him, hee is made a good tree: now [A good tree cannot bring forth bad fruit, Mat. 7. 18. --- And ergo, a good man cannot doe bad workes. Againe, hee is made a fruitfull Branch of Christ the true vine, as it is John 15.5. I am the Vine, yee are the branches, he that abideth in mee, and I in him, the ſame beareth much fruit. And Ergo, That fruit only which is good, which ſimilitude of a

^{a Ridaſte.} Branch much illustrates the matter (in their imagination.) For as in a vine-branch. If first it haue ſufficient moisture from the body of the vine. Secondly, if it haue ſufficient heat of the ſunne to diȝeſt that moisture. And thirdly, if it bee not hurt nor hindred by Froſts, wette, windes, wormes, or other ſuch diſcommodities of the Ayre and ſoyle; then certainly it will beare very much, and very good fruit: ſo is it in a man regene-rate. From Chriſt he receiues ſufficient moisture of di-vine grace, which is in him, [as a well of water ſpringing up vnto euerlaſting life. John 4.14.] He hath heat ſufficient of ſpirituall affection, to cauſe him to bud forth into good workes. For Chriſt ſaith [^a I am come to ſend fire on earth, and what will I if it bee already kindled. Luke 12.49. And [Did not our hearts burne within us] ſaid the two diſciples that went to Emaus, Luke 24.32. Ergo, they haue heat enough. Finally, they haue no impediment. Neither inward. For why? It is written, Rom.8.1. There is no condenmation to them that are in Chriſt Ieſus. Ergo, no inward impediment to well doing. Nor outward. For it is written, [nothing ſhall ſeparate uſ from the loue of God, that is in Chriſt Ieſus our Lord, Rom.8.38. Ergo, no outward impediment of good workes.

Herevnto wee make anſwe. That this argument is a ſophiſtically cauillation; which proues that which wee doe not deny. They ſay that a man regenerate, hath ſufficientia principia recte & honeste operationis. We ſay ſo too; confeſſing that hee is made a good tree, a fruitfull Branch; that hee is enlightened, ſanctified, and ſtrengthened by the ſpirit of God vnto the performance of good workes. WEE grant that now hee is enabled to doe well, who before his Regeneration could
doe

doe nothing saue ill: but the question still remaines, whether now he doe so well, as that he doth nothing ill when he doth best. W^eee grant that the *Vine*, which in former time yeelded nothing, but wild grapes, now being transplanted and grafted into the best *Vine*, beares good grapes: but we deny that they are so weet & kindly in euery respect, as not to haue a little relish still of their former wildnesse & sownesse. W^herfore our aduersaries doe but trifle with vs to tell vs that man regenerate hath meanes sufficient to doe those workes that be good: this we deny not; but we question whether they haue helpe sufficient to performe any worke so absolutely and perfectly good, that God himselfe cannot charge it with any sinne at all. This wee constantly deny. And to their discourse, (*That a Regenerate man hath sufficient knowledge, power and will to doe good perfectly*) in this they affirme more then will euer bee proued. Our imperfections in euery one of these three particulars witnessed to our conscience by *Scripture and experience* doth disable vs euer from doing any worke entirely and totally good. Knowledge we haue: but much darkned by ignorance. We haue a will to doe good: but that also corrupted with much froward Rebellion. A power we haue to doe good: but alwaies crossed and much restrained by manyfold Lusts within, and Temptations without vs. How is it possible for vs, being compassed about with so many infirmities: but wee should offend in one thing or other, *Becan^{us}* here brings vs an instance of a good worke: and bids vs shew what sinne there is in it: *If* (saith he) *A man regenerate reade or heare these words of Christ. Mat.6. [gine almes]* he being enlightened knowes that this is a worthy and honest worke. Whereupon he is touched in heart and stirred vp to doe it. H^ee comes to this motion, and resolues upon the execution, which

(ſuppoſing that hee be rich) nothing now can hinder bee
 hee is both able and willing to giue. Now then this alme-
 ing thus giuen out of knowledge, and a pious motion] of
 heart tending to Gods honour and our neighbours good.
Iefuite desires to know of vs, where there is any ſinne i
 Vvee say there is ſome euill in euery good worke & th
 fore hee would haue vs tell him what euill there is in
Almesdeed. Vnto this we say, that this enquiry of the
 ſuite is the moſt ridiculous and abſurd thing that can be
 asketh vs where is the ſinne? What if we anſwere him
 doe not know; Is he now euer the wifer? What hath hee
 ned thereby? Are other mens worke without all fault
 cause we know not what they bee? Nay, are they wiſ
 fault, because themſelues know not whether there bee
 within them: or no? What ſillinesſe were it to argue in
 ſort? Therefore when wee come to this point ſtrictly to
 amine the workeſ of men. First wee tell the *Iefuite* that
 muſt not put caſes touching generaliſties [ſuppoſe that]
 good worke bee done ſo and ſo what then] wee diſpute
 touching particulares in every Mans reall praetice. Th
 quiry is not for the generall. (what euill is there in fact
 ſuch a good worke) done thus and thus, according to the
 circumſta[n]ces are framed in an imagined caſe. As to aske
 ſinne is therein an almes-deede done out of *Faith and*
rity to Gods glory. This is a fond queſtion thus framed
 generall termes we ſay there is no ſinne in it. But the
 quiry is in particular, what euill there is in ſuch a w
 done by this or that man, according to all circumſta[n]ces
 that were at that time incident to the worke, as, *What*
was there in Zacheus or Cornelius almes-deeas? This queſ
 we admit and anſwere to it, that ſome ſinne there was
 which thoſe holy men, as well as others, would not

Beene willing that God should enter into iudgement with them, strictly to iudge them. Yea, but will the Jesuites reply, name what sinne this was; or else you wrong them. Now this is meere impudency. For who is iudge of their actions? Are wee? Or is it God and their owne *Consciences*? wee can be no judges, who at furthest can iudge but according to outward appearance. We know not their *Hearts*: nor are we priuy vnto euery particular circumstance, that did accompany those actions of theirs. Circumstances in euery particular action differ infinitely, one man may offend in this point, another in that: nor haue wee a *generall rule* whereby to iudge alike of all. And therefore it is a childish *querre* to aske one man whether another man offends, who may doe euill a 1000 times, not only *secret* from others, but *vnnitting* to himselfe. If then the *Jesuite* will haue an awnser to his question, hee must resort to particular mens *Consciences*, and to God: for only the *spirit* of Man, and the *spirit* of God knowe the things of Man. Let him aske a *Cornelius* when he giues almes, whether hee doe thinke this worke so well done, that no fault can bee found with it. Doubtlesse he will answere, that he cannot excuse himselfe from all faulcknesse: though hee knew nothing by himselfe, yet he dares not stand to Gods iudgement. His confession and prayer would in this case be the same with *Nehemiah*. *Nehem. 13.22.* [Remember mee O my God concerning this also, and spare me according to the Greatnesse of thy mercy.] at once begging fauourable acceptance of his obedience, & ratious pardon of his infirmities. If this suffice not in the ext place, the *Jesuite* is to repaire to God almighty and iestion him, wheres the *sinne* in such & such a good worke, to no doubt can shape him an awnser that will soone confound his *pride and folly*, and make it quickly appeare

vnto him, that ſinfull man, when he pleades with God, is not able to anſwere him one obiection of a 100, that God ſhall make againſt him.

This of the third argument. That man hath ſufficient meanes to doe well and not ſinne. The laſt followes, drawne from ſuch absurdities, as they lay doe follow vpon our Doctrine. Thus.

4. If (ſay they) our doctrine bee true that the best workes of men be ſinfull: then theſe absurdities be likewife true doctrine. That to be iuſtified by faith is to be iuſtified by ſinne. That no man ought to beleeue, because the worke [Beleeuwing] is ſinne. That all good workes are forbidden, because all ſinne is forbidden. That God ſhould command vs to commit ſinne: because hee commands vs to doe good workes. That God bidding vs be zealous of good workes, ſhould in effect bid vs be zealous of mortall ſinne. That to pray for the pardon of ſin were a damnable ſinne. Theſe and ſuch other absurd poſitions would be true: if the Protestants doctrine concerning the ſinfulneſſe of good workes may stand for good.

Herevnto wee anſwere. That theſe absurdities iſſue not out of our Doctrine, but out of our aduersaries malitious Imaginations. Who like the raging ſea casting vp mire and Dirt from its owne bottome, would ſaine throw all tis filth in the face of the Reformed Churches, to make them odious and hatefull to the world. The beſt is, Truth cannot bee disgraced though it may be belyed. Theſe foule absurdities touch vs not: but follow vpon that Doctrine which is none of ours. Namely, *That the good workes of the Regenerate are in their very nature altogether ſinne, and nothing else but ſordes, iniquamenta, & mere iniquitates.* Such an absurd

absurd affeſtione would indeed yeeld ſuch an absurd confeſſione. But we defended it not : and they abuse vs groſſly, when in their writings they report of vs the contrary that we doe maintaine. This onely wee teach. *That mens good workes are in part ſinfull.* Much good they haue in them: but withall ſome euill mingled therewith. Amongſt the gold ſome drosse alſo will be found, that will not bee able to abide the fire of Gods ſeuere triall. Imperfections will appeare in our best workes , ſo long as humane infirmity and mortality hangs vpon vs. This we teach, and from this doctrine all that haue reaſon, may ſee that no ſuch vnaeafonable conculſions can be collected. And let thus much ſuffice for the clearing of this third *Propoſition,* touching the im- perfection of our obedience to the *Morall Law of God,* euen in the *good workes* which we perforeme. From whence every godly heart ſhould leарne both *Christian humilitie* and alſo *Induſtry.* First, *Humility* not to boarſt in the flesh & glory in its owne *Righteousneſſe*, thinking that God muſt highly ac- count of , and reward largely, that which is very little worth. Secondly, *Induſtry* in a faithfull indeauour after per- fection. That what cannot be donie well as it ought, may yet every day be done better then before it was.

C H A P. IV.

Three generall exceptions againſt the truſhes deli- vered in this third Section.

THUS we haue ſtood long in the confirmation of our ſecond Argument, touching the *imposſibili- ty of Mans fulfilling of the Law* in this life, and ſo conſequently of *inſtitution by the Law.*

Againſt all that haue beene ſaid for the prooſe of this point; our Adverſaries haue three *Common and Generall Exceptions.*

Exceptions. Which are thele.

- Bet. L4. c. 37.
Et peccatum alibi*
- 1 *That concupisence or naturall corruption in the first and second act of it, is not sinne.*
 - 2 *That imperfection in our charity and obedience is no sinne.*
 - 3 *That smaller fautes, or (as they call them) Veniall sins, doe not hinder the iustice & goodnessse of any good worke.*

i Except. To these three *Positions* they haue continually recourse. For whereas they cannot deny; but that there is in the *Rege-nerate*; both a pronesse of nature vnto evill, and also many inordinate *sinfull motions* arising thence: they first deny, that either these *Naturall corruptions*, or *disordered motions* of the heart be any *sinnen*.

Againe, they confess that no man hath such perfect *love* of God and Man; but that he may increase in *charity*: nor be his good workes so perfectly good; but that they ought still to striue to doe them better: but then here also they deny, that this imperfection of our charity and good workes, is any sinne.

Lastly, they grant that no man can avoid *veniall sinnen*, scarce in the best workes he doth: but then they deny that *veniall sinnen* be contrary to the Law, so that albeit a man commit them, yet he may perfectly fulfill the Law of God. I cannot stand largely in the refutation of these foule errors. The confutation whereof belongs properly to the *Article of remission of sinnen*; where the nature and kindes of sinnen are to bee handled. For this present I shall touch on them briefly, and proceed to the matter.

Conclusion

- 1 For the first; we defende this *conclusion*.

The vicious inclination and pronenesse of nature unto evill, as also the inordinate motions of concupisence which

which goe before consent, they are sinnes even in a man regenerate.

That the inclination and pronenesse of nature to sinne is a sinne, we proue thus.

It is expresly so called by the Apostle, *Rom.7.* not once nor twice: but almost in euery verse of the Chapter. *I am carnall sold under sinne. The sinne that dwelleth in me v.17. 20. The law of sinne, vers. 23. 25.* In it selfe it is sin, & deserues the wages of sinne, eternall death. For which cause the Apostle there calls it. *The body of this death, vers. 24.* Because this inward corruption (which is like a body that hath many members consisting of diuerse euill affections spreading themselues throughout his whole nature) made him lyable vnto eternall death, from which only Gods mercy in Christ could deliuер him.

2 To rebell against the Law is sinne. *Ergo, To haue a rebellious inclination is sinne likewise.* For if the act be euill, the habit must needs be naught: if the Law forbid one; it must needs forbid the other. If it be euill to break any Commandement in act: is it not euill to haue a pronenesse and readinesse of minde to breake it? The habit denominated a man sinfull and not the act. Nor doth God lesse abhorre the pronenesse of man to offend him: then wee doe abhorre the rauenous disposition of a Wolfe, though it be a Cubb, not yet vsed to the prey, or one tied vp in a chaine, and kept from rauening.

The euill motions of the heart without consent be sinnes.

1 They are forbidden in the Morall Law. In the tenth Commandement. *Thou shalt not couet.* For motions with consent are forbidden in the other Commandements. As appeares manifestly in Christ's exposition of the Commandements. *Mat. 5.22.* where not only the outward act of Adultery.

Iam. 3. 12. 13

Iam. 4. 8.
Clense your
hands: purg
your hearts.

2

1

dultery: but the inward desire is also forbidden; if wee belieue Christ the best interpreter of the Law: When Ergo the tenth Commandement forbids coveting [of our neighbour wife, it either meanes the same kinde of lusting, with a needless Tautology: or a different, viz. that which is not consented vnto. Nor can our Adversaries shift this off: though Bezaues most impudently denies it, without any reason of his so doing.

Zam. 2. p. 885.

2 We proue it thus. Whatsoeuer is inordinate and repugnant to the right Reason: that is sinne.

But these motions without consent be inordinate.--- Ergo they be sinne, the Minor is confessed. That these motions be *inordinati & rectarationi repugnantes*.

The Major is apparent. For what is *Ordo & recta Ratio in Moralibus*: but that course of doing any thing, which is conformable to Gods Law and his will. God is the God of order. His Law is the *rule of order* in all *humane actions*. Regarding what is it; but the *conformity of mans understanding and will vnto Gods will*, which only is the *rule of righteousness*; Vee never purpose and will matters aright: but when we will them agreeably to Gods will. Wherefore it is a grosse absurdity to deny the *surfulness* of these disorderly motions: seeing no man can breake those orders which God hath made, and yet be faultlesse. Nor is it possible a man should doe that which is contrary to Gods will: And yet bee without sinne in doing of it. These motions then without consent bee *confusions in nature, opposites to the righteousness of the will of God*, and vnto that euen & straight order expressed in his Law.

Wee conclude then that *Concupiscence* and inordinate motions of the Soule not consented vnto, are *Sinnes contrary to our Aduersaries assertion.*

They

They bring some reasons to prove they are not.

1. *Originall sinne is taken away in Baptisme. But con-* 1. Arg. adi
cupiscence is not taken away in Baptisme; as appeares
by experience in the Regenerate, in whom it re-
maines. -- Ergo, concupiscence and pronenesse to sinne
is no sinne.

This Argument is frivilous. In *Originall sinne*, there are two things, first, *the guilt*. Secondly, *the inherent corrupti-*
ons. Wee say in *Baptisme* the *guilt* is altogether washed a-
way from the Baptized Elect, by the blood of *Christ*. And
soe the corruption thereof, it is in part done away by the *san-*
ctifying spirit of Christ, powred out vpon the *Regenerate*,
which by degrees purgeth out the inherent sinfulness of na-
ture, by replanting the *graces of Sanctification* in all parts.
Concupiscence then, notwithstanding *Baptisme* remaines
in the Regenerate, & is a sinne in them, the guiltinesse where-
of God mercifully pardons in Christ.

2. *what is not in our power to avoid: that God doth not* 2. Arg. adi
forbid vs by his Law.
But tis not in our power to avoid the motions of the
heart that prevent reason and consent. Ergo, they be
no sinnes forbidden vs.

To this we answere. The *Maior* is true in things merely *Naturall*, that fall out by the *Necessity* of nature well dispo-
sed. So we say, Gods Law were vncouth, should hee com-
mand a man neuer to be an hungry or thrist, which things he
cannot avoid, but they come vpon him, will hee, nill hee; by
the meere necessity of nature. But concerning inordinate
motions, there's no such matter. God hath laid no such ne-
cessity on nature in her creation: but wee by our sinne haue
brought it vpon our selues.

Now such a *necessity excuses vs not*, In this case it helps

a man no more to say. [I cannot avoid evill thoughts & desires.] then it doth a desperate sinner, that by continuance hath hardened himselfe in euill courses; or then it helps the Diuell and the damned, if they should say; We cannot chuse but doe evill.

- 3.Arg.adv. 3 They argue thus. That which would haue beeene naturall and without fault in man, if hee had beeene created, in puris Naturalibus; that is, no sinne nor fault in vs. But motions preuenting consent, would be naturall, and without fault in men so made. Ergo, In vs they be no faults in themselves.

Here our Adversaries haue made a man of white Paper, or the like to *Materia prima*: that hath not any quality in him morally good or bad. That is, a man that hath neither the Image of God in knowledge, righteousness, and holines, engrauen on his understanding, will, affections, and whole person; nor yet, though it haue it not, hath in him any contrary euill quality, that comes vpon him by reason of such a defect. Now of such a *Wiseaker* they dispute. If God had created a man thus, *in puris naturalibus*, neither good nor bad, then. What then? As the old word is. *If the Heauens fall we shall haue Larkes good cheape*. Suppositions framed by our imaginations touching what might bee done, are vaine and needless when we see what is done. This we see that man was created in Gods image, inuested with all *all Qualities of Righteousnesse and Holinessse*. This wee see also, that man being fallen is borne in *Originall corruption*, deprived of Gods image, and therevpon depraued in his whole nature by *sinfull infirmity*. Wherefore a man in his pure *Naturals*, one that hath neither *Grace*, nor *Corruption*, was never found in this world: yea, 'tis a contradiction to imagine a man thus naked without his *Qualities*; that hee bath

hath *Reason*, but neither enlightened, nor darkned, a will but
meereley indifferent, neither inclined to good, or euill; affe-
ctions, but neither vertuously, nor vitiusly disposed. In a
word, that he is a man capable of *Vertue*, or *Vice*; *Holiness*,
or *sinfulnesse*, and yet hath neither. That were to make a
man little better then an *unreasonable Beast*. But to follow
them a little. Suppose a man were made in his *pure Natur-
al's*, would such disorderly motions be found in him? Yea,
say they, and that boldly. *Si homo crearetur à Deo in puris na-
turalibus, procul dubio constaret duabus partibus repugnantib-
us, Spiritu & Carne: & haberet duos appetitus contrarios,
Rationalem & Sensitivum; ergo naturaliter haberet quo-
dam motus repugnantes Rationi.* Without doubt the *Jesuite*
Becan. Tom. 2.
tract. 4. cap. 4.
quest. 1. sect. 25.
is deceiued in this his imagination, and his Argument is not
worth a Button. A man in his pure naturalls should haue
two parts, a Soule and a body, *Spirit* and *flesh*; hee should
haue two appetites, *Reasonable* & *Sensuall*, ergo, these parts
in their motions and desires would bee contrary one to the
other. This consequent is false. They would be diuerse, not
opposite and repugnant. The Body & the *Sensitives* would
lead a man to those things that are agreeable to the body.
The *Soule* and *reasonable appetite*, or will would incline him
to those higher and more noble obiects agreeable to the
Soule. But neither of these inclinations would crosse & trou-
ble one another, the *inferior faculties*, like the lower
Spheares would moue differently from the *superior*: but
yet most orderly according to their owne nature, without
impeaching the motions of the other. Each faculty in it's
place would worke orderly in sweet harmony and agree-
ment each with other, had not *Sinne* brought in *confusion*
and *discord* into the world, as betweene God and man: so
betweene man and himselfe. This *wee further make good*

by this argument. Whatsoever is naturall, and so without blame in the Man: that Christ tooke on him. ---But these inordinate motions of the *sensitiae appetitie*, repugnant vnto *will* and *Reason*; Christ took not on him---*Ergo* they are not *naturall*, and without blame. The *Maior* wee proue by that, *Phil. 3.7.* *He was made like unto man*: and *Heb. 2.17.* *In all things it behoued him to bee made like unto his Brethren.* And againe, *Chap. 4.15.* *Wee haue not a high Priest which cannot be touched with a feeling of our infirmities: but was in all things tempted in like sort: yet without sinne.* Whence 'tis manifest that Christ taking on him our nature, tooke on him all the properties of our nature, and with all such infirmities of our nature as are not sinfull in themselves, or the effects or punishments of *Sinne* in vs. If therefore it be naturall vnto Man, -that the motions of the *sensitiae appetitie* should prevent and be repugnant vnto *Reason*, and that there is no *Sinne* except consent make it so: then certaintely Christ had in him such motions and inordinate desires. But to affirme that, there were in Christ such disorderly motions o this inferiour faculties, repugnant vnto his *Reason* and *will*, is a blasphemie against the *immaculate Lambe of God*. Christ was indeed tempted (as the text saith) and in like sort as we are: but will any man here understand this of inward *Temptations* arising from any thing within Christ, as if hee were like vnto vs drawne aside with ^b*Concupiscence* and inticed, the motions of his *sensitiae faculties*, inclining him to that which was contrary to his vnderstanding and will? Wee confess that he was fiercely tempted by *Satan* and wicked men from without: but that he was tempted by any thing in himselfe, by disorderly motions of his heart tending vnto evill, and ergo checked by his will and reason, this wee account an abominable errore touching the *spotless humani-*
ty

of our Sauiour. Wherin we deny, that there euer was any the least disorderly desire, thought, word, or work what-
ever. And therefore wee conclude, that such motions are
~~at naturall vnto men, becomming sinfull only by accident,~~
because they are consented vnto : but they are ~~accidentall~~
vnto him, being the fruit of originall corruption, and are in
hemselfes verily and properly Sinnes.

For Conclusion of this point, let vs heare that Argument ^{Arg.Bell.} which Bell. makes.

4 Where there is no law, there is no sinne. Rom.4.10.

Lib.4.cap.11.

But there is no Law prescribed vnto sense and sensuell
appetites. Ergo The motions thereof are not sinfull.

The Maior wee grant. The Minor he proues because
the Law presupposed Reason in all that whereto it is
giuen. But the sensitive part of man is without reason,
and ergo not capable of a Law, according as it is in
bruite beasts, to whom ergo no Law is giuen. This hee
further proues by that place, Rom.7.20. Now if I doe
that I would not, it is no more I that doe it, But sinne
that dwelleth in mee. Where 'tis plaine (saith Bell.) that
the Apostle did not sinne, because he lusted against his
will. Twas not he did the worke: but twas the sin in
him. Wherfore he faith afterward. That in his mind,
i. e. in his superior faculties he served the Law of God:
and kept it: although in his flesh, i. e. sensitive appetite
and inferior faculties he served the Law of sinne: yet,
for all that he sinned not in so doing, because sinne can-
not be but in the minde, and the law is not giuen to
those faculties that be unreasonble.

To this wee answere. That God giues no law to vnrea-
sonable Creatures, but such as haue Reason. The sensitive
faculties of bruite-beasts haue no other Rule then Natures

instinct, which guides and moderates their severall motions in due order and measure. But in man those inferior faculties how ever unreasonable, are yet capable of *Reasons Government*, which according to Gods Law prescribes unto the motions of the sensitive appetite their measure and bounds, beyond which they may not passe. If a man were vncorrupt, the appetite would obey this rule of Reason and keepe it selfe within those prescribed bounds. But being now corrupt by sinne, it breakes out beyond this compass and overbeares Reason and will, which in their sinfull weaknesse are not able to bridle these vnruley motions. Wherefore when Bell. saith. *That the law is given to the reasonable will, not to the sensitive appetite;* it is vtterly false; Because in man it is capable of government, and so subject to the Law. Our Reason hath even in this our corrupted estate a ciuill command ouer our appetite & affections; so that it can moderate them by faire persuasions now and then. That which it can doe sometimes, it ought to doe alwaies, and if any affections can obey reason at sometimes, were they not infected with sinne, they would doe it at all times. And if they doe well when they obey, certainly they doe euill when they disobey. And ergo such motions of them, as are repugnant to right reason, are nothing but rebellion against Gods Law. As to the place in the 7. Rom. we answere. That that interpretation of it which Bell. brings is most peruerse and against all sense. The Apostle complaines that he did the Euill, which he would not; no doubt in so doing he did sinne. But what is it now which committed this guilt or sinne? *It is not I that doe it saith the Apostle: but that sinne that dwelleth in mee.* That is, according to Bell: not I in my mind, or superior faculties of Reason and will: but my inferior appetite and affections which doe

Soe this euill against my consent. So the meaning shall bee
Concupiscentia in that duell in the Apostle committed sinne:
 but the *Apostle* himselfe committed it not. Which is very ab-
 hornd. As if a *Cholerickē man* having done a mischiefe in his
 anger shoulde say, it were not he did it; but his raging paſſion:
 or an *aduiterer*, that 'twas not hee committed the sinne;
 but his ſintull affection that carried him further then *reafon*
 would. So that if God will punish ſuch a ſinne; hee must
 not punish him: but only his ſenſitive appetitie which was in
 fault. That is ridiculous, for beſides that it croſſeth the *Ro-
 mifh Doctrine* maniſtely; in teaching that ſuch disorderly
 motions of the ſenſitive appetitie be no ſinnes, which here
 the *Apostle* contradicthes, ſaying plainly (*that the ſinne
 which dwelleth in him did doe the euill hee would not*, *viz. Sin*)
 it drawes after it this groſſe error. *That ſome faculty in man
 may ſinne, and yet the man not ſinne himſelfe.* Wherefore
 the *Apostle* in that ſpeech, *'Tis not I doe it: but ſinne in mee,*
 doth not oppoſe one faculty againſt the other, the *reafonab-
 le will*, againſt the ſenſitive appetitie, ſeeking for a ſhift to
 excufe his ſinne, by putting it off from himſelfe, to that
 which was not capable of *Sinne*: but he oppoſeth *grace* in
 euery facultie to *Corruption* in the ſame facultie, as two con-
 trarie *Principles* and *cauſes* of his *actions*, one moving to
 good; the other enclining to bad. Thence the *Apostle* faith,
 that (*when he doth euill*) *'tis not I that doe it*. i.e. I regene-
 rate according to the *Grace*, that dwelleth in me, for that in-
 clineth me to doe good: but *'tis the ſinne dwelling in mee*
 which (*when I would doe well*) inclines mee to doe euill.
 He heere ſhewes the ſoothe, whence this euill comes: but yet
 he doth not put off the fault from himſelfe. As *'tis himſelfe*
 doth well: ſo *'tis himſelfe* doth ill too, according as hee con-
 cludes, verſe 25. *Then I my ſelfe, i.e. aȝd Doe both well &*

ill; well, according to grace, *in my minde* that is regenerate part both of inferior and superior faculties. *I serue the Law of God* but ill according to corruption remaining in mee: but *in my flesh*, the vnregenerate part, *the Law of Sinne*. Much more might bee added: but 'tis not my purpose, here to enter vpon the common place at large.

I proceed to the second question of our aduersaries, who teach that *albeit our loue of God be imperfect: yet this imperfection is not sinne in vs*. They grant. That no man hath any grace of the spirit: but hee may encrease in it daily, that the loue of God and our Neighbours may still grow on to farther degrees of affection; that no grace, nor good work hath that full perfection, which it might haue in this life, or which wee shall attaine vnto in Heauen. But they deny this defect to be any fault or sinne:

² Exception.
Bell. lib. 4 cap.
10. & 17.
& cap. 20.

2. *Defectus Charitatis quod (viz.) non facimus opera nostra tantum seruore detectionis, quanto facimus in patria; defectus quidem est: sed culpa & peccatum non est. saith Bell. and againe Charitas nostra quamvis comparata ad Charitatem beatorum, sit imperfecta: tamen absolute perfecta dici potest.*

This is an error against which wee defend this Conclusion in generall, touching both charity and all mans Righteousnesse.

The defects or want of perfection in mans Righteousnesse is Sinne.

For the proofe of this point wee are to obserue, that the Imperfection, or Perfection of any thing is to bee considered of two waies.

1. *Comparatively.* When any thing set by another is more or lesse perfect, then that other.

2. *Absolutely.* When considered in it selfe, it hath or wantes

Conclusion.
concl.

wantes that *perfection* which it should haue by its proper Nature.

Betweene these three is great difference, For Comparative imperfection is not euill: absolute imperfection is euill. Wee may see it in an example. The fenses that are in man being compared with their like in other creatures, tis manifest they are much excelled by them, as by an Eagle for sight, a spider for touch, &c. Here wee say that the eye of a man is not so perfect as the eye of an eagle: but yet wee doe not account this imperfection any *Naturall euill* of the eye of a man. God might haue ginen a stronger and a clearer sight to men: but wee blame not his workes; nor count our sight imperfect because it hath not that singular temper which is in other *Creatures*; but because it wants at any time that temper which is agreeable to our nature. Such a defect only, is properly an euill in nature, when something is wanting to the perfection of any part, which by the course of nature should be there. Thus tis also in Grace. Compare we the *Righteousnesse* of man, or *Angels*, with the *Righteousnesse* of God: we saie that God is *infinitely* more perfect than the *Creatures*. But now is this *imperfection in humane or Angelicall righteousness* any euill and Sinne in them? We say no. Neither are the *Angels* sinfull because leesse righteous then God: nor *Adam* sinfull because leesse righteous then either God made them both leesse good then himselfe: yet *very good*, and without all sinne. There be degrees of *Righteousnesse*, and though the creature bee infinitely below the highest pitch of *goodnesse* (which is God:) yet he may be still aboue that lowest descent vnto *sin* and *unrighteousnesse*. In *Philosophie* wee dispute whether the slackening of any degree in one *Quality*, bee the mingling of another that is *contrary*. As hear in eight degrees

if it decrease vnto seauen, whether there is any degree of cold mingled with it. 'Tis hard to say that there is. But concerning Grace and Righteousnes 'tis certaine, there is that *remissio graduum* without any admixtion of Sinne & iniquity. As the Holinesse of Saints is lesse then that of Angels; that of Angels lesse then the Holiness of Christ's glorified Humanity, this lesse then his Deity. And yet in the least of these Righteousnesse there is no unrighteousnesse at all to be found, no nor in the severer judgement of God. Except we say there is unrighteousnesse in Heaven where no uncleane thing can enter. Well then. What Imperfection of mans righteousness is it, which is Sinne? We say. That *Imperfection*; when man in any Grace or good worke wants that degree of goodness, which he ought to haue. As in nature. If the eye want the cleerenesse of sight which should be in it: 'tis a naturall euill. *Inmorality* if a man want that Temperance or degree of Temperance he ought to haue, is a vitiouse and morall euill: so in Grace the want of that righteousness or degree of Righteousnesse which God requires to be in man, is a Sinne and spiritall euill. All such *primitiōns* of what should be present are euill in what kind soever. If they be in nature they be *mala miseranda*; deserve pity and cure: if in *Virtue* and *Grace*; they bee *mala culpanda* worthy of blame and punishment. Such defects as these in *Grace*, when man falleth short; not only of that which is in others; but that which should be in himselfe, doe alwaies arise from the mixture of *Corruption* and *Sinne*. He that loues not God or his neighbour so much as hee ought to doe: 'tis because his heart is wicked, at the least in part; and that hee loues other things more then he should doe. These things are certaine and vndenieable according to those words of S^t Augustine that are *authenticall*. *Profecto illud quod minus*

est quam debet, ex virtute est. And againe. ^b *Peccatum est, vel
cum non est charitas, que esse debet: vel minor est quam de-
bet.* 'Tis a sinne, notto loue God at all: or to loue him lesse
then we shoule. Wherefore here wee aske the Jesuite whe-
ther *Charity & other Graces* in a man *regenerate* bee so per-
fect in this life, as they ought to bee. If he say, they be not so
perfect, as they ought to bee, how can hee affirme that this
defect is no fault nor *Sinne*: Can a man possibly doe worse,
or be worse then he shoule; and yet bee in no fault therefore?
If he say they be as perfect as they shoule be, his owne *Con-
science* and the *Conscience* of all the men in the World will
gain-say him for a liar. No man can say, that he loues God
and his neighbour as much as he ought to doe: and that he is
not bound in euery *grace* and *good worke* to attaine at grea-
ter perfection, then he hath for the present. Hee that thinkes
himselfe come nearest vnto the marke, will yet be driven to
confesse, that he falls many bowes short of those patternes
which he ought to imitate, *Adam* in his *Innocency*; *Christs
Humanity*, and the *Saints* in *Heauen*. Vee here bid them
(*Dipinge ubi siham*) make a point where wee shall stoppe:
that when wee are come so farre, wee neede seeke no further
perfection. If they cannot doe this, then they muste confesse,
as the truth is, that every man is bound by Gods command-
to be more holy, to bee more perfect in all *Grace* and *good
workes*; and so farre as hee wants any degree or dramme of
goodnesse, that should be in him and his workes, so farre he
is sinfull and guilty of a fault.

3 I goe on to the last Assertion of our aduersaries, which
is touching *veniall sinnes*, (*viz:*) *That these doe not hinder* ^{3 Exception} *the righteousnesse of mens good workes.* A man may be a per-
fect just man, though he commit many veniall sinnes. The rea-
son whereof they make to be [*because veniall sinnes are not
contrary*]

^b *L. de perfect.
Iustit. resp. 15.*

contrary to charity, the loue of God and our neighbour, and so may stand well enough with the fulfilling of the law.]

Against this error, tending to the obduration of mans heart in impenitency and loue of sinne : wee maintaine this conclusion.

*Conclusion
contr.*

Those sinnes which the Church of Rome calls veniall, doe truly make a man regenerate, & his workes unrighteous in the sight of God.

This wee proue by this one argument.

Whosoever transgresseth the Law he is unrighteous in so doing.

Bat hee that committs veniall sinnes, transgresseth the Law. Ergo, He that committs veniall sinnes is an unrighteous man.

lib. 4 cap. 14.

The Major is vndeniable. For the Minor our aduersarie is at a stand. They are loath to grant it: yet cannot tell how to deny it with any honesty. Bellarmine after one or two shuffling distinctions of *simpliciter*, & *secundum quid*, perfecte and imperfecte, at last plainly denies that *veniall sinnes* be contrary to the Law. For answering unto those places in *Iames*. [*In many things we offend all*,] and that in *John*. [*If we say we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues.*] He saith they cannot handfornely shift themselues of those places, who hold that *veniall Sinnes* be [*proprete contra legem*.] Such as bee of that opinion [*Let them looke to it* (saith hee) *what they will answere to that of Saint Iames.*] He that *keeps the Law in one point, &c.*] He therefore will be more wise and wary. [*Solidas igitur responsio est* (saith hee) *Pecata venialia, sine quibus non visiatur, non esse peccata simpliciter, sed imperfecte & secundum quid: neque esse contra Legem, sed preter legem.*] And thus saith he, *Omnia coherentes* (like Pebbles in a withe) [*Nam qui offendit in uno, preua-*

praevaricans scilicet unum praceptum, reus est omnium, & simpliciter iniustus constituitur & tamen in multis offendimus omnes, quia tametsi nihil facimus contra legem; tamen multa facimus preter legem. Et quis natus est ex Deo, non peccat transgrediendo legem, & tamen si dicamus quia peccatum non habemus. (viz.) nihil preter legem faciendo: nos ipsos seducimus, & veritas non est in Nobis.] This is an vnbound Besorne, as will appeare by vndo. Other mea-
ning of these
words (a-
gainst) & (be-
sides) there
can be none ing that distinction which seemes to hold it together. *Ve-
niall sinnes are not against the law: but besides the law.* Well, we must now know what is against the Law, & what given. besides. That is against the Law, when any thing is done which the Law forbids; or left vndone which it commands. That is besides the Law, when the thing done is neither commanded, nor forbidden in the Law, Hee then that commits a *venial sinne*, doth some such act as the Law neither forbids nor commands. Here then we aske. Bee *venial sinnes, sinnes?* Yea, they be. Is God offended with them? Yea, and hee may iustly punish them on vs with the losse of heauen. For so Bellarmine himselfe confesseth. [*Peccata venialis nisi misericorditer remittantur impeditur ab ingressu illius Regni in quod nihil coinqvinatum intrare potest.*] Now sure this is admirable, that such acts as these should defile a man, deserue hell, offend God, in a word be sinnes, and yet for all this neither commanded nor forbidden in any law of God. Was there euer such a toy heard of as this? As *sins* beside the Law. Tis a most ridiculous contradiction, *Peccatum preter Legem.* Hee that doth any thing beside the law, not mentioned, nor included therein by way of prohibition or command, tis most apparent he sinnes not, or offends not at all. For whom doth he offend, or who can challenge him of

T Sinner:

Sinne? Doth God the Law-giuer? No, for twas not his intention to command or forbid such an act, and *ergo*, bee it done or not done, it croſſeth not his will: nor hath hee any reason to finde fault or be displeased at it. *Satan* or *Man* cannot accuse him. For let them then shew the Law that proues him an offender. If they cannot alleadge a law against which he hath transgrefſed: they wrongfullly accuse him of a fault. Were it not an absurd accusation against a prisoner at the barre, to say that he hath indeed done nothing against the Lawes of the Land: but many things besides the Law not forbidden nor commanded in the Law, those hee hath done and deserues to be punished for it as an offender?

But now if those *veniall finnes* bee mentioned in Gods Law: then are such actions either commanded or forbidden. If commanded, then the not doing of such a thing, is plainly contrary to the law. As for example. To ſteale a *penny*, or ſome other ſmall matter, to ſpeak an idle word, to tell an officious lie; theſe bee *Veniall finnes*, ſay our Adverſaries. But how knowe they, they bee *finnes*? Who told them ſo? The Scriptures they will ſay. Where? In the 8 & 9 Commandement. Aske them now. Did God intend in those Commandements to forbide thoſe actions of *ſtealing* and *lying*? Yea, or no? If he intended it not; then tis no ſinne at all to doe them, ſeeing it croſſeth not Gods will, nor offendeth him. If he did intend to forbide vs thoſe things: then to doe the n is a ſinne, maniſtely contrary to the holy will of God, the Law-giuer. Wherefore let vs here remember that excellent rule of *Bernard*. [*Non iuſa quidem licet utrumlibet, vel admittuntur vel omittuntur: iuſa vero fine culpa non negliguntur, fine crimine non contemnuntur.*] For things not commanded: wee may either lawfully doe them or leauue them: but for things commanded, to negle&t them is a ſin,

*Bern. de pra-
cept. & dispense.*

to

to contemne them is a haynous ciime. Wherefore this diſtincſion of ſinnes againſt, and ſinnes beſide the Law falleth to duf: and our *Minor propoſition* ſtands firme: That hee who committeth *veniall finne*, tranſgrefſeth the law of God and therefore is vnrighteous for his ſo doing.

^a *Beſauſ* here forſakes the *Cardinall* in this diſtincſion: ^{a Tom. 2. tr. 2. cap. 2. q. 2.} and helps him by another devise. Hee grants that *Veniall finnes* be againſt the Law, and proues it, [*because every Veniall fin is moraliter malum, and ergo contra rectam rationem & legem eternam.*] But heres now the diſtincſion: It is one thing to be *contra legem*, another *contra finem legis*. All *Veniall finnes* be againſt the law: but no *veniall finne* is pro‐perly againſt the end of the Law, that is, againſt *Charity the loue of God or our Neighbour*. Is not this a ſuperfine inuen‐tion? As if a *Subiect* that hath in many things broken the law, ſhould ſay. True my faults bee againſt the law of the land: but yet they are not againſt the end of thofe Lawes. *viz.* obedience to my Prince, and loue to the good of him and my country. Though I breake the lawes: yet I would nothauē you thinke, but I loue and honour my Prince and Country well enough. Iuſt ſo the *Jefuites*. A man may com‐mit many ſinnes againſt Gods law: and yet obſerue the end of the law, in louing God with all his heart; and his Neigh‐bour as himſelfe. Then which nothing can bee more ſenſe‐leſſe that a man ſhould offend God in breaking of his Law: & yet notwithstanding loue God with his whole heart. That a man ſhould wrong his Neighbour doing that to him which he would not haue done to himſelfe: and yet, for all that, loue his Neighbour as himſelfe. (*If yee loue me keep my Commandements*) ſaith Christ, John, 14. 15. Nay (ſay the *Ro‐manifts*) we loue him and yet breake his Commandements. (*Loue dgh̄t not euill to his neighbour*) ſaith the Apostle,

Rom. 13.10. Nay (say the *Jesuites*,) loue may doe euill to his neighbour: and yet keepe the name of loue. A man may be angry with another without cause, reuile him, and call him *Rachis*, he may defraude him in small matters (for these they make *veniall sinnes*) & yet in the meane time, all this without breach of charity. Himselfe would not willingly bee so vsed: but he will vise another in this sort; and yet looke to be thanked for his loue too. Such grosse absurdities doe our aduersaries runne into, by coining such senselesse distinctions of (*Sinnes not against the law: but besides the law*) of *sinnes not against the end of the law*: though *against the law it selfe*. Our consciences cannot be satisfied with such silly shifts: & therefore we leaue them vnto those that can content themselves to choake vp their consciences with a little Sophistry. Men who make a pastime of sinne, and take liberty to qualifie and dispense with Gods law as they thinke agreeable to their conscience; hoping by *tricks of wit and dodging Distinctions* to avoid the accusations of conscience, & to elude the severity of Gods judgement.

SECT. 4. CHAP. 1.

Iustification by works makes void the covenant of grace, of the difference betweene the law and the Gospell, of the use of the law. Of the erroneous conceit of our aduersaries in this point.

THUS much of these three exceptions of our second Argument, prouing the impossibility of our iustification by the workes of the law, because we cannot perfectly fulfill the law. We goe now forward vnto two Argements more, taken, the one

one from the difference of the two Covenants God hath made with man. First of workes, the other of Grace: and the other from the nature of true Christian liberty obtained for us by Christ's death.

3 Argument. That which makes void the covenant of grace is a false and heretical doctrine.

But justification by workes of the law, makes void the covenant of Grace. Ergo, Tis false and heretical so to teach.

For confirmation of the Minor in this Argument wee must briefly shew. 1 (What the Covenant of Grace, what the covenant of workes is) 2 what opposition there is between these two.

By the Covenant of Grace we understand in one word, the Covenant of Gospel, i.e. the gratiouse appointment of God to bring man to Salvation by Iesus Christ. In the administration of this gratiouse purpose of God we must obserue foure periods of time, wherein God hath diuersly ordered this meanes of mans salvation.

1 The first is from Adam vntill Abraham. Wherin Period. 1 God made the promise to Adam anon after his miserable fall: and renewed it as occasion serued vnto the Patriarches and Holy men of that first age of the world. viz. That (the seed of the woman should break the Serpents head) This blessed promise containing the whole substance of mans redemption by Christ, was religiously accepted of, and embrased by the seruants of God in those times, who witnessed their faith in it, by their offering of sacrifice as God had aught them: and their Thankfulness for it, by their Obedience and holy Conversation.

2 The second is from Abraham to Moses. After that men had now almost forgot Gods promise and their owne.

T 3 duty:

duty: and *Idolatry* was crept into thosse *Families*, wherein by succession the Church of God had continued, God call forth *Abraham* from amongst his *Idolatrous* kindred, and with him renues that former *promise* in forme of a *Leagu-*
and Couenant confirmed by word & solemne Ceremonie
God on the one side promising to be the God of Abraham
and of his seed, & that in his seed all the nations of the earth
should be blessed: Abraham for his part beleueing the pr-
mise, and accepting the condition of obedience to walke before God in uprightness. This Couenant with Abraham is
ratified by two exterrnall ceremonies. One of a fire-brasa
passing betweene the peices of the Heifer and other Beasts,
which Abraham, according to the custome in making of
Leagues had diuided in twaine, Gen. 15. The other the Sa-
crament of Circumcision vpon the flesh of Abraham and his
posterity, Gen. 17.

3 The third period is from the time of *Moses* vntill *Christ*. When / after the Church multiplied vnto a Nation, & with all in processe of time, and continuance among the *Idolatrous* *Egyptians*, grew extreamely corrupt in Religion and Manners) God againe revives his former *Couenant* made with *Abraham*. Putting the *Jewes* in remembrance of the *Couenant* of grace in *Christ*. 1 By adding vnto the first *Sacrament* of *circumcision* another of the *Passeouer*, setting forth vnto the *Jewes*, the *Author* of their deliuernace; as well from the spirituall flauery and punishment of sinne; as from the bodily bondage and plagues of *Egypt*. 2 Afterwards by instituting diuers Rites and ceremonies concerning *Priests* *sacrifices*, &c. all which were shadowes of good things to come(*viz.*) of *Christ*, the *Churches* redemption by his death. Which things were prefigured vnder thosse types though somewhat darkly, yet plainly enough to the weake vnder-

understanding of the *ewes*. Who in that *Minority* of the Church stood in need of such Schoolmasters and Tutors to direct them vnto Christ.

The fourth period and last is from Christs death, to the end of the world. Who in the fulnesse of time appearing in our flesh, accomplished all the *Prophecies* and *promises* that went before of him: and by the sacrifice of himselfe, confirmed that covenant a new: which so long before had beeene made with the Church. Withall having abolished what ever before was weake and imperfect, hee hath now replenished the Church with abundance of knowledge, & of grace, till to continue and increase, till the consummation of all things. In all these periods of time, the grace of God that brings salvation to man was euer one and the same: onely the Revelation thereof, was with much variety of *circumstances*, as God saw it agreeable to every season. In the first was called a promise, in the second a covenant; in the two last Periods, a *Testament*; the Old from *Moses* till Christs death; the New from thence to the worlds end, in both *Remission of sinnes*, and *saluation* bequeathed as a Legacy vnto the Church: and this bequeast ratified by the death of the *Testator*, typically slaine in the Sacrifices, for confirmation of the Old: Really put to death in his owne *Person*, for the *Sanction* of the *New Testament*. But notwithstanding this or any other diuersity in *circumstance*, the substance of the *Gosbell*, or covenant of *Grace*, is but one & the same, throughout all ages. Namely, *Iesus Christ yesterday, and to day, and the same for euer*.

In the next place. By the *Covenant of workes*, wee understand that we call in one word the *Law*: Namely, That meanes of bringing man to *Saluation*, which is by perfect obedience vnto the will of God. Hereof there are also two

• • • feuarll

ſeverall administrations. ¶ The firſt is with *Adam* before his fall. When *Immortality* and *Happineſſe* was promiſed to man, and conſirmed by an exterrall Symbole of the *Tree of life*: vpon condition that he continued obedient to God, as well in all other things; as in that particular Commandement of not eating of the *Tree of knowledge of good and evill*.

2. The ſecond administration of this couenant was the re-ning thereof with the *Israelites* at Mount *Sinai*: where ſafter that the light of nature began to grow darker, and corruption had in time worne out the characters of *Religion* and *virtue*, firſt graued in mans heart) God reuiued the law, by a compendious and full declaration of all duties required of man, towards God or his neighbour, exprefſed in the Decalogue. According to the tenor of which law God entered into couenant with the *Israelites*, promising to bee their God, in beſtowing vpon them all blessings of life and hap-pineſſe, vpon conditiō that they would be his people, obeying all things that hee had commanded. Which condition they accepted of, promising an absolute obedience. *All things which the Lord hath ſaid we will doe. Exod. 19.24. &c.* also ſubmitting themſelues to all punishment in case they disobeyed; ſaying *Amen* to the curse of the law. *Cursed bee every one that conſirmeth not all the words of this law to doe them: and all the people ſhall ſay Amen. Deut. 27.26.*

We ſee in briefe what theſe couenants of grace & workes are. In the ſecond place wee muſt enquire what opposition there is betweene theſe two; *Grace and workes*; the *Goffell* and the *Law*. The opposition is not in regard of the ende wherat both doe aime. They agree both in one common end, namely the glory of God in Mans eternall ſaluation. The diſagreement is in the meaneſs, whereby this end may be attained; which are propoſed to men in one ſort by the

Law,

another by the Gospell. The diuersity is this. *The
rs life unto man vpon condition of perfect obedience,
the transgressors thereof in the least point with eter-
th: The Gospell offers life unto man vpon another con-
vix. Of repenteance and faith in Christ, promising re-
of sinnes to such as repent and beleeme.* That this is the
Essentiaall and proper difference betweene the *Coue-*
workes and of Grace (that is) betweene the Law &
bell, we shall endeauorto make good against those of
nisi. *Apostasy* who deny it. Consider we then the law
ikes, either as giuen to *Adam* before the promise: or
the promise it remained in some force with *Adam* &
ostery. For the time before mans fall. It is apparant
reft obediance was the condition required for the e-
ing of *Adam* in perpetuall blisse. Other meanes there-
t: nor needed any be proposed vnto him. But when
id failed in that condition; and so broken the *Coue-*
Workes: God to repaire mans ruined estate, now
ate of euer attaining vnto happines by the first means:
oints a second, offering vnto *Adam* a Sauiour, that by
him, and not by his owne vnsotted obediance, he
recouer *Iustification*, and life which he had lost. So
that *Adam* should haue obtained by workes without
now hee shall receiue by faith in Chrift without
es. Since the time of mans fall we must consider, that
w and *Gospell* though they goe together, yet as they
fer in their vse and office betweene themselues, so al-
Law differs from it selfe, in that vse which it had be-
nd which it had since the fall. To vs now, it hath not
ne vse which it had in mans innocency. It was giuen
us for this end, to bring him to life, and for that pur-
was sufficient both in it selfe, as an absolute rule of

Perfection: and in regard of *Adam* who had strength to haue obserued it. But vnto man fallen, although the band of obedience doe remaine: yet the end thereof (viz.) Iustification & life by it, is now abolished by the promise, because the law now is insufficiēt for that purpose, not of it selfe, but by reason of our sinfull flesh, that cannot keepe it. This is most manifest by the renewing of the first *covenant* of workes with the *Iewes*, when God deliuered vnto them the Morall Law, from *Sinai*, at which time God did not intend that the *Iewes* should obtaine *saluation*, by obedience to the Law. God promised life if they could obey, and the *Iewes*, as their duty was promised they would obey; but God knew well enough they were never able to keepe thier promise, & ergo twas not Gods intention in this legall *covenant* with the *Iewes*, that any of them shoulde euer attaine *Iustification*, and life by that meanes. as at first the *Promise* need not to haue beeene made vnto *Adam*, if the Law could haue suffised for the attaining of life: so after the promise was once made, the Law was not renewed with the *Iewes* to that end that *Righteousnesse* and *life* should bee had by the obseruation of it. This is the plaine doctrine of the *Apostle Gall. 3.* in that his excellent dispute against *Iustification* by the Law. The doubt that troubled the *Gallathians* was this. God had made an *Evangelscall covenant* with *Abraham* ^ that in *Christ* he and his faithfull seed should be blessed; that is, *Iustified*. Afterward 430 yeares hee made a legall *covenant* with *Abrahams posterity*, that they shoulde liue, that is, be *Iustified* & sauued, if they did fulfill all things written in the Law. The *Question* now was, which of these two *covenants* shoulde stand in force, or whether both could stand together. The *Apostle* answeres, that the former *covenant* shoulde stand in force, and that the later did not abrogate the former;

ior yet could stand in force together with the former.
he expreſſeth v. 17. 18. And this I ſay, that the covenant
was confirmed afore of God in respect of Christ, the law
was 430 yeares after, cannot diſanull that it ſhould
the Promise of none effect. For if the inheritance (viz.)
beoufneſſe & life, be by the law; it is not by the promise:
it gave it to Abraham by promise, here now they might
t, wherefore then ſerueth the law? If men cannot bee
ed by keeping the Law, to what end was it giuen fo
ſter the Promise was made? To this the Apostle anſ.
It was added (unto the promise) because of transgreſſion:
Her's the true uſe of the Morall law, ſince the fall of
not to iuftifie him and giue life: but to proue him to
iuft and worthy of death. It was added [because of
transgreſſions] that is. 1. To conuince man of ſinne, that he
be put in remembrance what was his duty of old; &
was his present infirmity in doeing of it, and what was
wrath againſt him for not doeing it. That ſeeing
impoſſible it was for him to attaine vnto life by this
way of the Law, firſt appointed in Paradise, he might be
led and driuen to looke after that new way, which
had ſince that time laied forth, more heedfully atten
the Promise, and ſeeking vnto Christ, who is the end of
law vnto every one that beleueſ in him. Which uſe
pointed out vnto the Lewes, figuring Christ vnto them
Mercy ſeat, eouering the Arke wherein the tables
covenant were kept, and in the Sacrifices appointed
ſorts of Transgreſſions againſt this Covenant. To ad
the Lewes a further thing was aimed at in giuing
the Law, namely the bringing of them---- to Christ
omifed ſeed, in whom remiſſion of ſinnes, and Life e
was to be had. 2. To restraine Man from Sinne.

That the Law might be a perpetuall rule of Holinesse and Obedience whereby man should walke and glorifie God to the vtmost of his power. That so those *Iewes* might not thinke that God by making a gratiouse *promise*, had vtterly nullified the Law, and that now men might liue as they list; but that they might know these bounds prescribed them of God, within which compasse they were to keepe them-selues, that so the ouerflowing of *iniquity* might bee restrained. These most excellent, perpetuall and necessary vies of the morall law, God intended in renewing of the *Legall covenant* with the *Iewes*: and ergo the *Apostle* concludes, that God did not crosse himselfe, when first he gaue the *inheritance* to *Abraham* by promise, & afterwards made a *Legall covenant* with the *Iewes* his posterity. *Is the law then against the promises* (saith the *Apostle*) *God forbid*. *For if there had beene a Law giuen, which could haue giuen life, surely righteousnesse shoulde haue bin by the law*: But the *Scripture* hath concluded all under sinne, that the promise by the faith of *Iesus Christ* might bee giuen to all that beleiuē. verse 21.22. Whence it is most cleare that the Law and the *Gospell* in some things are subordinate and vphold one another; in other absolute, and destroy one another: As the Law by the discouery of sinne and the punishment of it, humbles man & prepares him to receiue the *Gospell*. 2 As the law is a sacred direction for *Holinesse* and *Obedience* to those that haue embrased the *Gospell* and all others. 3 As the Law requires *satisfaction* for the breach of it, and the *Gospell* promises such *satisfaction*: this the *law* and *Gospell* agree well together and establish one another. But as the Law gines life to them that perfectly obey it, and the *Gospell* gives life to them that stedfastly beleiuē it: thus the law and *Gospell* are one against the other, & overthrow one another. And ergo if

if God had giuen such a Law to the *Iewes*, as could have brought *Saluation* to them through the perfect fulfilling of it: 'tis apparent that God had made voide his former covenant vnto *Abraham*, because *Righteousnesse* shoule haue bin by the law and not by *Christ*. But now God gaue no such Law, as could bee kept by the *Iewes*, as the *Apostle proves*, because all were *sinners* against it; and therefore it followes that notwithstanding the giuing of the Law, the *Promise* standes good for euer; and *Righteousnesse* is to bee obtained onely by the *Faith of Iesus Christ*.

From hence wee conclude firmly. That the difference betweene the Law and the *Gospell*, assigned by our *Divines* is most certaine and agreeable to the *Scriptures*. viz. That. *The law giues life unto the iust vpon condition of perfect Obedience in all things*: *The Gospell giues life unto sinners vpon condition, they repent & beleine in Christ Iesus*. Whence it is plaine. That in the point of *justification* these two are *incompatible*, & that therefore our *minor proposition* standes verified. *That justification by the workes of the law, makes voide the covenant of Grace*. Which *proposition* is the same with the *Apostles assertion else-where Gal. 2.21. If righteousnesse be by the Law Christ died in vain*. and Gal. 5.4. *Ye are abolished from Christ: whosoever are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace*.

By so much more iniurious are these of the *Romish Church* vnto the *Gospell of Christ*, when by denying this difference, they would confound the Law and *Gospell*: and bring vs backe from *Christ* to *Moses*, to seeke for our *Justification* in the fulfilling of the *Moral law*. They would persuade vs that the *Gospell* is nothing, but a more perfect law, or the law perfect by addition of the *Spirit*, enabling men to fulfill it; *That the promises of the Gospell bee vpon this*

condition, of fulfilling the law, with such like fluffe. Their Doctrine touching this point is declared vnto vs by Bellarmine lib. 4. de iustificat. cap. 3. 4. Where he coines many distinctions betweene the Law & Gospell: but will by no meanes admit of that which our *Reformed Divines* make to bee the chiefe. The chiefe distinction which he conceaues to be betweene them he strained thus. *The Gospell (saith he) is taken in a double sense.* 1. *For the Doctrine of Christ, and his Apostles by them preached and written;* 2. *For the grace of the Holy Ghost giuen in the new testament, which he makes to be the Law written in our hearts, the quickening spirit, the law of faith, charity sted abroad in our hearts, in opposition to the Law written in stone, to the dead and killing Letter, the Law of Workes, the spirit of bondage and feare.* Upon this hee proceeds to the difference betweene the Law and the Gospell. Thus. *The law teacheth vs what is to be done, the Gospell (if it be taken for the grace of the holy Ghost), so it differs from the Law; because it gives strength to doe it: but if it be taken for the Doctrine deliuered by Christ and his Apostles, so it agrees with the law, teaching vs, as the law doth, what things are to be done.* This argument the Jesuite illustrates and proues in three particulars.

I. *The Gospell contains, Doctrinam operum, or leges. For Morall precepts, they be the same in the Gospell, that be in the law; even those precepts that seeme most euangelicall. (viz.) of louing our enimies, witness of this all the writings of the new Testament, wherein every where wee finde precepts and exhortations to the same vertues, Prohibitions and rebortations from the same vices which the law forbids or commandes. So that for Moralls, the Doctrine of the Gospell is but the Doctrine of the law; namely (that is) most cleerely and ful-*

1 Cor. 3.

John. 1. 17.

Exod. 20.

ly

ly expounded. Nor is the Gospell more perfect in substance: but in circumstance a more perspicuous Doctrine.

Which though a truth, yet is very ridiculous prooved by the Cardinall out of Mat. 5. *Nisi abundauerit &c. Vnlesse your righteousness exceed. What? Hee saith not the righteousness of the law and Prophets: but of the Scribes & Pharisees; yee shall not enter &c.* A profound *Glosse.* (Christ would not adde to the burden of the law: but to take away from the false *glosse* of the Scribes & Pharisees.) Surely good cause had our Sauiour to taxe both the Doctrine of the Pharisees in interpreting, and their manners in their hypocritical practise of the law in outward matters; without inward obedience: But little reason was there that Christ should require of man more perfection then Gods Law required, & 'tis a fancy to dreame of any such meaning, in our Sauours speech.

2. *The Gospell containes Comminations, and threatnings as the Law doth Witnesse the many woes from Christ's owne mouth against the Scribes and Pharisees; together with those frequent denunciations of judgement and Damnation to such as are ungodly, that doe not repent and obey the Gospell.*

3. *Thirdly the Gospell containes promises of Life and happiness: but these Evangelicall promises be not absolute but upon the same condition, that the legall are. (viz.) Cum conditione implenda legis, Cum conditione Iustitia actualis, & operose, que in perfecta Mandatorum obseruatione consistit. Cap.2.*

This the Jesuite will proue vnto vs.

1. From that Mat. 5. *Vnlesse your righteousness abound &c.* (that is, in Bellarmines Construction) so farre as, *vnto the perfect keeping of the Law: you shall not enter into*

into the Kingdome of Heaven.

- 2 From Mat. 19.17. Mark. 10.19. Where Christ speaks to the young man, asking him what hee should doe to be saued. *If thou wilst enter into life keepe the commandements.* And to the Lawyer. (Luke 10.28.) who asked the like Question he answeres. *This doe and thou shalt live.* That is. *Fulfill the law and thou shalt be sauad.* In which words they say, *That Christ did preach the Gospell, and shewed unto these men the very Evangelicall way to salvation.*
- 3 From the many places of Scripture. Wherein Mortification of Sinne, and the studious practise of Holines. & Obedience is required of vs. As Rom. 8. *If yee mortifie the deeds of the flesh by the spirit, ye shall live.* So Ezekiel 18. 21. *If the wicked will returne from all his Sinnes, that he hath committed, and keepe all my statutes, and doe that which is lawfull and Right: hee shall surely live and not die.* With a number such like places.
- 4 From the very tenor of the Gospell. *He that belieueth shall be sauad: but hee that belieueth not, shall bee damned.* Where wee see the promise of life is not absolute, but conditionall. *If wee doe such and such works.*

John. 13.17. If
ye know those
things, &c.
John. 15. 14.
Ye are my
friends If ye
doe whatsoe-
uer I com-
mand you.

From hence the Romanist concludes: That seeing the preceptes, threatenings, and promises of the Gospell, bee for matter the same, that those of the law are: the true difference betweene the law and Gospell shall bee this. *That the law nakedly proposeth what is to be done without giuing grace to performe it: but the Gospell not only proposeth what is to be done, but withall giueth grace and strength to doe it: and therefore the law giuen by Moses the law-
giver*

ginner cannot iustifie, because it was given without the grace of fulfilling it: but the Gospell given by Christ the Redeemer doth iustifie, because it is accompanied with the grace of the holy Ghost, making vs able to keepe the law. For which cause also the law of Moses is a yoake unsupportable, the law of a feare and bondage; because it giues not grace to keepe it, but onely conuinceth our sinne, and threatens vs punishment: but the Law of Christ, the Gospell is a light yoake, a law of loue and liberty, because it giues grace to keepe it, and of loue to God and man: and so by fulfilling frees a man from feared punishment.

a Rom.8.15.

Gall.4.24.25.

This is the summe of the Romish Doctrine touching the difference betwixt the morall law and the Gospell in the point of iustification, as it is deliuered vs by Bellarmine, the rotten pillar of the Antichristian Synagogue. Wherein we haue scarce a syllable of distinct truth: but all perverted by equiuocations and grosse ambiguities, as shall appeare by a short suruey of the former discourse. Whereas then he distinguishest the Gospell into the doctrine of Christ, & his Apostles, and into the grace of the holy Ghost: let vs follow him in these two parts.

First for doctrine. Wee grant that the Gospell is often so taken: but in this matter about iustification, this acceptation is too large, and not distinct enough. For although, by a Synecdoche of the chiefeſt and moſt excellent part, the whole doctrine and miniftry of Christ and his Apoſtles with their ſucceſſors, be called the doctrine of the Gospell, and ^b the miniftry of the Gospell: yet all things which they preached or wrote, is not the Gospell properly ſo caſled. But as Moſes chiefly deliuered the law vnto the Jewes, though yet with all he wrote of Christ, and ſo in part reuealed

b Rom.12.16.
At that day
when God
shal judge the
ſecrets of men
by Iefus Christ
according to
my Gospell.

led vnto them the Gospell : so Christ and his Ministers, though chiefly they preach the Gospell, yet in its place they vrge the law withall , as that which hath its singular vse in furthering our Christian faith and practise. Wherefore when we speake of the Gospell as opposite to the Law , tis a *Iesuisticall equiuocation* to take it in this large sense. For the whole doctrine of Christ and his Apostles , preached by them, and written for vs in the Booke of the new *Testament*, we follow the Apostle in his dispute of iustification, *Gal. 3.4.*
5. And according as he doth take the Gospell strictly for the promise of iustification & life made vnto man in Christ Iesus. This is in proper termes the Gospell (*viz.*) that speiall doctrine touching mans redemption and reconciliatiōn with God by the meanes of Iesus Christ ; the Revelation whereof was indeed [*everyman*] the gladdest tidings that were ever brought to the eare of mortall man. Which Gospell in strict termes the Angells preached, *Luc. 2.10.11.* *Be-hold I bring you glad tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. That unto you is borne this day in the City of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord.* And afterward Christ and his Apostles fully explained the mysteries thereof vnto the world. According to this necessary distinction, wee answere. That if wee take the Gospell in that large acception, tis true which *Bellarmino* hath. That the Gospell containes in it the Doctrine of workes (*viz.*) the Morall law, even the very same precepts, prohibitions, threatnings, and promises which are deliuered in the law. All which as Christ and his Apostles preached: so may all Ministers without blame, yea, they must, if they will avoid blame , presse the same vpon their hearers, seasonably and discreetly , that the law may make way for the better receauing and entertainment of Grace in the Gospell. But hence it followes not , that the Gospell

Gospell properly so taken , is to be confounded as one and the ſame thing with the Law ; because the law is conioyned with it in the preachings and writings of the Ministers of the New *Teſtament*. They ſtill are diuided in their nature & offices : nor hath the Gospell any affinity with the Law in precepts, threatnings, or promises. Wherefore when *Bel-larmino* teacheth vs. That *Euangelicall promises bee made with condition of perfect fulfilling the Law*. Tis a desperate errore , and that in the very foundation. You heard his proothes before recited : ſee now a little how paſſing weake they be.

I Mat. 5. Except your righteouſneſſe, &c. To this wee anſwere. The plaine meaning of the place is this. Our righteouſneſſe muſt abound more then that of the *Pharifees* (that is) It muſt not be outside only as theirs was : but inward righteouſneſſe of the heart , in inward ſanctity of the thoughts and affections, as well as of the outward action : or elſe ſuch our hypocriſie will keepe vs from entring into hea-ven. But doth it hence follow , that because wee muſt bee more perfect then theſe *Pharifees* , we muſt bee as perfect in all things as the law requires : we muſt exceed them, *Ergo*, equall the holineſſe of the law in all points ? Because wee muſt be ſyncere without hypocriſie, *ergo*, we muſt be perfect in all things without blame ? Such conſequents as theſe, the *Iefuite* hath concluded out of his owne head , not out of the Text.

Touching that ſpeech of Christ to the young man. *Mat. 19.* and the Lawyer, *Luk. 10.* That if they did fulfill the law, they ſhould liue. We anſwere , that Christ in ſo ſpeaking vnto them did not preach the Gospell : but ſhewed vnto them the legall way to ſaluation. For theſe erring that grand error of the Jew in ſeeking for righteouſneſſe not by faith

but by the workes of the law, seuering the law, from Christ the end thereof; (as the Apostle shewes *Rom. 9.31.32. &c. 10.3.*) and so supposing to bee saued by doing some good thing. Christ answers them in their humour, as every one shoud be answered, that swells with high conceits of his own righ-teousnesse and workes, that there was a law to be kept: and if they could fully obserue the righ-teousnesse of it, they should be saued, sending them of purpose to the law, that they might be humbled thereby and see their great folly in seeking for life by that, which they were so vnable to keepe: *cau. iij. lib. 3. cap. 18. §. 9.* Against which answer the Jesuite hath nothing to reply, but stands much in confuting of another answere made by some of our Diuines. That Christ spake these things ironically. This Bellarmine seekes to confute; nor doe I labour to confirme it; though it might be iustified for any thing he brings to the contrary.

3. Vnto those places of Scripture that euery where almost promise life, blessednesse, the fauour of God, vpon condition of *[holiness in life and conuersation; that we mortifie the lusts of the flesh, walke in the spirit, ouercome the world &c.]* We answere, that *Obedience is one thing, perfect obedience is another.* We say that the promises of the Gospell be all vpon condition of *obedience:* but none vpon condition of *perfect obedience.* Tis an iniury done vnto vs, whea they say; we teach that *Evangelicall promises be absolute & without condition,* as if God did promise and giue all vnto vs; & we doe nothing for it on our parts. We defend no such dogtage. The promises of the Gospell bee *conditionall (viz.)* Namely vpon condition of *repentance and amendment of life.* That we stedy to our power to obey God in all things; but this is such a condition as requires of vs *sincerity and faithfulness of endeavour, not perfection of obedience in the*

the full performance of euery jot and tittle of the law.

Vnto the last argument, from the tenour of the *New Covenanter* (viz.) That we must beleue if we will be saued; ergo, the promise of the Gospell is with condition offulfilling the law. This is an *Argument* might make the Cardinalls cheeke as red as his cap, were there any shame in him. Faith indeed is a worke: and this worke is required as a *condition* of the *promise*: but to doe this worke, *To beleue*, though it be to obey Gods commandement; yet it is not perfectly to fulfill the whole law; but *perfectly* to trust in him, who brings mercy and pardon for transgressions of the law.

CHAP. II.

Of Bellarmines erronious distinction of the word Gospell.



Of much of the first member of the *Iesuites distinction*, wherein his sophisticall fraud appeares, taking the Golspell for the whole doctrine of the *New Testament*, published by Christ and his Apostles; and ergo, confounding the law and the Gospell as one: because he findes the law as well as the Gospell delivred vnto vs, by our Sauiour and his Ministers: I proceed to the second branch of it. *The Gospell (saith he) is taken for the grace of the Holy Ghost given vs in the New Testament: whereby men are made able to keepe the law.* Tis so taken. But where is it so taken? The *Iesuite* cannot tell you that: [*vt verum fatur (saith he) non enim Evangelij non videtur in Scripturis usquam accipi nisi pro doctrina.*] No good reason for it, in as much as tis evident to all men, that there is great difference betweene the doctrine of Mans saluation by the mercy of God through the *Merit of Christ* (which is proper-

perly the Gospell) and the graces of the holy Ghost bestow-ed on man in his *Regeneration*, whereby he is made able in some measure, to doe that which is good. But the fault is not so much in the name in calling the grace of God in vs by the name of Gospell: as in the misinterpretation of the matter it selfe. Wherin two errors are committed by the Jesuite.

1 In that he maketh the *grace* of the New Testament, to be such strength giuen to man: that thereby hee may fulfill the Law.

2 In that he saith. The Law was giuen without *grace* to keepe it. In both which assertions there is ambiguity and Errour.

For the first. We grant that grace to doe any thing that is good, is giuen by the Gospell, not by the Law. The Law commands: but it giues no strength to obey, because it presupposeth that he, to whom the command is giuen, hath, or ought to haue already in himselfe strength to obey it. And *Ergo*, we confess it freely, that we [receive the spirit not by the workes of the law: but by the bearing offaith preached] as it is Gal.3.2. The donation of the Spirit in any measure whatsoever of his *sancifying graces* is from Christ as a Saviour, not as a Lawgiver. Thus then we agree. That all grace to doe well is giuen vnto vs by the Gospell; but next we differ. They teach that the Gospell giues such grace vnto man, that he may fulfill what the law commands: and so bee iustified by it, we deny it, and say that *Grace* is giuen by the Gospell, to obey the law sincerely without hypocrisy: but not to fulfill it perfectly without infirmities. In which point the Jesuite failes in his proofes which he brings.

1 Out of those places where contrary attributes are ascribed to the law and gospell. Vnto the law. That it is [the ministry

ministry^a of death and condemnation] [Killing ^b letter] a 2.Cor.3.7.
 that it [worketh wrath] that it is a [Roake ^d of bondage] a b 2.Cor.3.6.
 [Testament ^c bringing forth children unto bondage.] But c Rom.4.15.
 vnto the gospell, that it is The ministry ^f of life] and [of Re- d Gal 5.1.
 conciliation]^e is the b [spirit that quickneth] the [Testament f 2.Cor.3.6.
 that bringeth forth children to liberty] which opposition g 2.Cor.5.19.
 Bellarmine will haue to bee', because the law gives precepts h 2.Cor. 3.6.
 without affording strength to keepe them: but the gospell 7.17.
 gives grace to doe what is commanded. But the Iesuite is here
 mistaken. These opposite attributes giuen to the law, are
 ascribed to it in a twofold respect, i In regard of the punish-
 ment which the law threatens to offenders (*viz.*) Death. In
 which regard principally the law is said to bee the ministry
 of death, to work wrath, to be not a dead, but a killing letter:
 in as much as being broken it leaues no hope to the Trans-
 gressour: but a fearefull expectation of eternall death & con-
 demnation of the law vnder the terrors whereof it holdes
 them in bondage. But on the Contrary the gospell is the mi-
 nistry of life, of reconciliation of the quickning spirit and of
 liberty, because it reveales vnto vs Christ in whom we are re-
 stored to life; from the deserued death and condemnation of
 the law, vnto Gods fauour, being deliuering from the wrath
 to come, vnto liberty, being freed from slauish feare of punish-
 ment. This is the chiefe reason of this opposition of Attri-
 butes. Secondly the next is in regard of obedience. In which
 respect the ministry of the Law is said to be the Ministry of
 the Letter written in tables of stone: but that of the Gospell
 is called the ministry of the spirit which writes the law in
 the fleshy tables of the heart. Because the law barely com-
 mands: but Ministers not power to obey; and so is but as a
 dead letter without the Verte of the spirit. But in the Gos-
 pell grace is giuen from Christ, who by the Holy Ghost san-
 ctifieth

Iustifieth the heart of his elect, that they may liue to Righteousnesse in a sincere thought not every way exact conformity to the law of God. The like answere wee giue vnto another proofe of his.

2 Out of that place (*John 1.17. The law came by Moses: but grace and truth by Iesus Christ.*) that is (*faith Bel-larmino*) *The law came by Moses without grace to fulfill it: but grace to keepe it, by Christ.*

We answere. The true interpretation of these words is this: *Moses* deliuered a twofold law, *Morall & Ceremoniall*. Opposite to these *Christ* hath brought a twofold *priviledge*. Grace for the *morall law*, whereby we vnderstand not only power giuen to the *regenerate* in part to obserue this Law, which strength could not come by the Law it selfe: but also, much more *Remission of sinnes* committed against the law, and so our iustification and freedome from the guilt of sinne and curse of the *Morall law*. Secondly, truth for the *Ceremoniall law* the substance being brought in & the shadows vanished. Wherfore the *Iesuist* erres greatly in this point, when he makes the grace of the *New Testament* to consist in this. That strength is thereby giuen vs to fulfill the Law. The grace of God in the *Gospell* is chiefly our *Iustification* and redemption from the curse of the Law: and in the next place strength afforded vs to obey the law in some measure not perfectly as our aduersaries woule haue it. In the next point he erres as much in saying that the Law of *Moses* was giuen without grace to obey it. A false assertion. For altho the law of it selfe giue not grace: yet tis certaine that grace was giuen by *Christ* euuen then when *Moses* published the law. Sufficient for the prooffe hereof are. 1 These excellent properties ascribed vnto the law of God, as in other places of the *Old Testament*: so specially in the booke of the *Psalmes*

res. And amongſt the in the 19. & 119. P. where the law
od is ſaid to (gine light to the eyes, to conuerſe the ſoule,
ioice the Hearſe &c.) which it could not doe of it ſelfe,
nor the grace of the Holy Ghost beene giuen in theſe
ſ. Without which the Law could worke no ſuch ſauing
ts. 2 Experience of thofe times in the faith Patience and
iſtence, and all ſorts of graces ſhining in thofe auncient
ts, who liued before & after the law was giuen. Which
is they receiuēd from the Holy Ghost, ſhed vpon their
is by vertue of Chriſt mediation, whereby they recei-
trentgh to liue holily in obedience vnto the law of
The diſference betweene thofe times, and thofe vnder
aw, is not, that wee haue grace and they had none: but
in the meaſure & extent of the ſame grace beftowed,
on vs and them. In thofe times as the Doctrine of the
ell was more obſcurely reuealed, ſo the grace which ac-
panies it was more ſparingly diſtributed, being conſi-
to a Church collected of one nation, and beftowed v-
at Church in a leſſer meaſure, the now; though yet ſuf-
itly in that meaſure. But in the times of the new Testa-
t, the light ſhines more brightly, and grace is diſpenced
liberally, being extended indifferently to all Nations
poured vpon the Godly in a larger abundance: accor-
as was promiſed Jeremiab. 31. Though alſo this com-
on muſt be reſtrained vnto whole Churches, what ge-
y is now done; for no doubt in many particulars ſome
vnder the law exceede for abundance of grace, many
r the Gofpell. Wherfore it is a notable iniury vnto the
nty of God, and the honour of thofe Saints of old, to
ide them from partaking of the Gofpell; to affirme that
were led only by the Spirit of Feare, and not of loue; they
receiuēd not the Spirit of adoption to cry Abba

Thou art our
Father See
Becanuſ Tom. 2.
Tract. 4 cap. 5.
Quaſt. 1. 2. 3.

Y father

father as well as wee though not plentifully as wee; and so b that they were not sonnes though vnder *Tutors* and *governours*, as wee conesse they were but very seruants held in Bondage and excluded from the inheritance of grace, & glory till after *Christs Death*. So that at best their adoption was but *conditionall* with regard of time to come: but, for the present, they were handled as slaves fear'd with temporall punishments allured by temporall rewards, like a heard of swine fed with base acornes and huskes. These bee absurd errors bred out of Scripture misvnderstood, Especially that of *John: 1. Grace came by Christ. Ergo, not before Christs incarnation.* A silly Argument. *Christ* is as old as the *world*, and his grace as ancient as the name of man vpon earth. Grace alwaies came by *Christ*, and was in its measure giuen by him long before he appear'd in the flesh. Hee was euer the head of his Church, and that his body, which he alwaies quickned by the blessed influence of his spirit ministred therenvto. Wherby the *Godly* before as well as since his *incarnation* were made liuing members of that his *mystical Body*. Wherefore it is apparant, that grace is not to be tied to the times of the *Gospell* and feuered from the Law. Nay, as of old the Law was not alwaies without grace: so now many times the *Gospell* it selfe is without grace *Christ* himselfe being a *stumbling stone and rocke of offence*, the *Gospell* a *anour of death* to many of those, vpon whom *Grace* is not bestowed; to beleue and embrace it.

I conclude then. That this difference, which our aduersaries make betweene the Law and *Gospell* is fafe: and that their error is pernitious in making the *Gospell* to be nothing, but the spirit added to the Law that man may fulfill it to his Iustification. That thus a man may bee saued by *Christ* through the perfect fulfilling of the law. Which is a monstrosus

stros and vncouth Doctrine laying an vnsportable burthen vpon the conscience of man and hazarding his soule to eternall destruction: whiles by this meanes hee frustrates the Grace of God in Christ; and withall frustrates his owne hopes of life expecting to obtaine it by that Law which hee is never able to fulfill.

S E C T . C H A P . I .

*Iustification by fulfilling the law, ouerthrowes
Christian liberty, the parts of our
Christian liberty.*

 O much of the third arguient: The last followes drawne from the Nature of *Christian liberty*.
Which is this.

4. Arg. *That which ouerthrowes our Christian liberty purchased for vs by the death of Christ: that's no Evangelicall, but an Hereticall Doctrine.*

But iustification by the workes of the law ouerthrowes the spirituall liberty of man obtained for him by Christ.

Ergo. 'Tis an heresie against the Gospell.

For the prooofe of the minor proposition, let vs in briefe consider wherein stands that Liberty wherewith Christ hath made vs free, that so we may the better perceiue what part thereof this doctrine of iustification by workes doth nullifie and deprive vs of. The liberty wee haue in *Christ* is either in regard of the *Life to come*, or of *this present life*. The first is the *liberty of Glory* consisting in a full deliuerance from the state of *vanity & misery*, both *sinsfull & painfull*, wherunto we are now subiect. And not wee only, but the whole *Creation*, which with vs *ouerigne y' our aduersarie groaneth and traualleth in paine*, till with vs it also *be deliuered*, *Come the*

Ανείστης οὐ πρόπετος εἰς τὴν λαύρην τῆς δόξης τὴν τίκτουσαν τὸ Θεῖον;
From the bondage of corruption, into the Glorious liberty of the sonnes of God,) as the Apostle declares Rom.8. 19. & seq.
 This liberty we haue in hope, not in possession. The next we actually inioy in this life, and that is the *liberty of grace*. This we may diuide not vnfitly into three branches: 1 *Freedome from sinne*: 2 *Freedome from the Law*: 3 *Freedome from Men*.

1 Our Freedome from sinne stands in 2 things; 1 *In our deliurance from the Punishment of Sinne*. For whereas every sinne in its owne nature brings with it guiltines, and a fure obligatiō vnto punishment, binding ouer the transgressor vnto the paines of Gods eternall wrath by a stronger chaine then of Steele or Adamant: Christ by his meritorious satisfaction hath broken these bonds, and ransomed vs from this fearefull bondage vnto Hell and destruction. *He being made a curse for us, hath redeemed us from the curse of the law.* Gal.3.13. That is, By taking on himselfe the punishment of our sinnes in his owne person suffering, and satisfying the wrath and iustice of God, he hath once for euer set vs free from the dreadfull vengeance of God, which wee deserue should fall vpon vs for our iniquities.

2. In our deliurance from the power of sinne, which though it abide in vs in the reliques of our corrupted nature: yet by the power of the *Holy Ghost* dwelling in the *Hearts of the Regenerate*, it is subdued and kept vnder, that it doth not reigne nor exercise its commanding authority without controle. So that whereas the *Unregenerate* be the Seruants of Sinne, wholly at the command of *Satan* and wicked affections, the *Regenerate* are freed from this *slavery* being ruled and guided by the *Spirit of the Lord*, which wherefoeuer it is, there is liberty, as the *Apostle speakes*, 2 Cor.

*Cor. 3.17. Liberty from that blindnesſe wherēin wee are holden by Nature, not knowing what the will of God is. Liberty from that rebellion and infirmity of our nature, whereby wee are, nor willing, nor able to doe the will of God. From which we are freed in part by the Spirit of Christ, intlightning our mindes, and changing our hearts. This Liberty from ſinnes dominion and damnation, S^r Paul ioynes together, Rom. 8.2. {The law of the ſpirit of life, which is in Christ Iefus, hath freed me from the law of ſinne and of Death.) And againe, Rom. 6.14. Sinne ſhall not have domi-
nation over you, for ye are not under the law, but under grace.*

2 Our freedomne from the law is either from the } ^{Ceremoniall} or } _{Morall law.}

The Ceremoniall law contained in it diuerſe Carnall Ordinances (*discretaria capud*) to endure vntill the time of reformation. From all which Christ hath freed the Church of the New Testament, as namely. Heb. 9.20.21.

1. From the whole burthen of Legall ceremonies whatsoeuer vsed in the worship of God. Those reſemblances are of no vſe now, when the ſubſtance it ſelſe is come in place: nor may ſuch beggarly and impotent rudiments be ſought after, when greater perfection is to be had Gal. 4.9.

2. From that restraint in things indifferent, wherevnto the Jewes were tied: but wee are not bound. Such are the obſeruations of dayes, of meates & drinkes, of garments, with the like. Wherin the Jewes were restrained: but our conſciences are left free, being taught that every creature of God is good being ſanctified by prayer and thanksgiving. 1. Tim.

4.4 5. And that to the ^b pure all things are pure. Only this being obſcured, that wee abuse not this our Liberty; but that as wee are informed by faith that, all things are lawfull.

for vs: so wee should be taught by *charity* to ſee what are expedient in regard of others. That a due regard be had of others infirmity, (that nothing bee done whereby the truly weake may be scandalized, as the Apostle commands, Rom. 14. 21. By which meanes *knowledge* on the one ſide ſtill preſerves vs, that our *conſciences* be not inſnared with *ſuperſtiſion*, & *charity* on the other ſide ſhall keepe our Liberty from degenerating into licentiousneſſe, & *vnchristian* contempt of our weake brethren.

2 Our freedom from the *Morall law* stands in this, that whereas the law requires of euery man, vpon ſtrickeſt termes of *Necceſſity*, full and coimplete obedience to all things whatſoever contained in it, if he will auoide the *punifhment* of Hell fire: *Christ* hath freed all that beleiuē in him from this heauy and rigorous exaction of the law, taking away from our conſciences this obligation vnto a neceſſary fulfilling thereof, vpon paine that wee shall forfeit *Heaven* if wee doe it not. As we ſhall ſee more anon.

This liberty from humane conſtitutions binding the Conſcience, is properly not a benefit purchafed for vs by *Christs* death: but it is an intire priuiledge of our creation, whereby our Conſciences are exempt from mens command, & onely ſubiect to Gods iurifidiction. Yet because this Liberty is a part of our ſpirituall Li- berty, it is vnually called Christian Li-

3 In the laſt place our freedom is from men: namely from all power & authority they may claime ouer our conſciences: they may hold our persons in ſubiection, but them cannot command ouer our conſciences. Wee acknowledge no Iurifidiction of man or Angel ouer our Conſciences; but onely that of God that created vs, and of Christ that hath redemeed vs. Whoſoever ergo ſhall impoſe vpon man any humane traditions, opinions, or Ordinations whatſoever to tie his conſcience vnto obedience by vertue of his own authority, ſuch a one trenches vpon Gods high Prerogative, and viſurpes tyrannically ouer the ſoules of men, according, as at this day that *Man* of Sinne doth. But here we muſt obſerue that humane conſtitutions be either Ecclesiasticall or Politicall Ecclesiasticall concerne either the matter and ſubſtance of

of Gods worship when any thing is invented by man, and commanded, wherein and whereby to worship God. 2 The manner and external order of Gods worship in the determination of indifferent circumstances tending to decency and comeliness.

For the former wee renounce and reject all *humane authority* whatsoeuer, that shall without warrant from the Scriptures prescribe vnto the *Church* any doctrine to bee received as a divine Truth or *custome, ceremony or practise* whatsoeuer to be obserued as a proper part of Gods most holy worship. According as our *reformed Churches* haue happily recovered their liberty by breaking asunder those cordes, and casting away that yoake of false doctrine of superstitious, *ceremoniall* will-worships, wherewith not Christ, but Anti-Christ had insnared and oppressed the Church. And they haue Gods owne warrant for so doing, *Isay. 29. 13.* ratified and explained by *Christ, Mat. 15. 9.* (*In vain they worship me, teaching for doctrine mens precepts:*) which was a thing contrary to Gods expresse commandement, *Ezech. 20. 18. 19.* (*Walke yee not in the ordinances of your fathers, neither obserue their manners, nor defile your selues with their Idoles: I am the Lord your God walke in my Statutes, and keepe my iudgements and doe them.*)

For the latter, namely *humane Constitutions* concerning indifferent *circumstances* in Gods worship, tending to orderly decency, agreeable to the simplicity and purity of the *Gospell*: herein wee must acknowledge the *authority* of the *Church* though not ouer our *consciences* to bind them: yet ouer our *Practices* to order and limit them. Accordingly as also we doe in the other branch of *humane obedience*. viz. *Politicall or ciuill*, comprising all law, touching lawfull things made for the gouernance of *Kingdomes, or inferior States*

Rom. 13. 5. *States by the supreme Magistrate, that hath authority so to doe. Whereunto wee (must be subject, not because of wrath only, but also for conscience sake.) For conscience sake, not because the highest Monarch on Earth hath power ouer the conscience of his meanest subject; to binde it by vertue of his owne authority: but because God hath established the Magistrates authority and commanded subjects obedience in lawfull things, & therefore wee cannot disobey them without breach of conscience, in disobeying and violating also Gods Commandement.* But otherwise for any immediate power the conscience, to restraine the inward liberty thereof, no man without presumption may arrogate it, nor any without flauish basenesse yeeld to another, as the Apostle commands (*ye are bought with a price, bee not yee servants of men.*) This is in briefe the Doctrine of Christians or spirituall liberty, which wee call Christian: 1. from the cause of it, Christ, by whose purchase wee enjoy it, 2 From the subject of it, Christians, in opposition to the *Levites*, who had not this liberty in all parts of it as wee haue. Namely in freedome from the ceremoniall Law, and restraint in things indifferent. In all other parts they in their measure were freed by Christ as well as wee. Againe wee call it spirituall in opposition to ciuill & bodily Liberty: because it stands in the freedome of soule & conscience, not in the freedome of the outward man; the bondage & subjection whereof is no impeachment to this spirituall freedome. As Anabaptistical Libertines would perwade the world contrary to the Apostles decision. 1 Cor. 7. 22. (*He that is called in the Lord being a servant, is the Lords Free-man.*)

C H A P. II.

Justification by workes subiects vs to the rigour and curse of the Law.

WE are now in the next place to see which branch of our liberty is cut off by the doctrine of *Justification by workes*. Not to meddle with others whereat it gives a *backblow*, but to take that which it directly strikes at: we say, it destroies our liberty from the morall law, which stands herein, that wee are not obliged vnto the perfect fulfilling of that law, vpon paine of *eternall damnation*, if wee doe it not. This gratiouse liberty Christ hath enfranchised vs withall, whosoeuer belieue in him: and they that now teach we are *justified by workes of the law*, doe rob our *consciencies* of this heauenly freedome, bringing vs againe vnder that miserable bondage vnto the Law, wherein all men are holden, which are in *the state of infidelity and unregeneration*, from whom the law in extre-
mest rigour exacts perfect obedience if they will be sau'd.

For the clearing hereof, this in the first place is manifest. That he which will bee *justified by the workes of the Law*, is necessarily tied to fulfill the whole Law: seeing 'tis impossible the law should justifie them that transgresse it. In the next place then we must proue, that for a *mans conscience* to be thus tied to the fulfilling of the law for the obtaining of *Justification*, is an vnsupportable yoake of *spirituall bondage*, contrary to that liberty, wherewith Christ hath made every beleeuere free. This shall appeare in confirming of this *Proposition*.

A man regenerate endued with true faith in Christ Iesu, is not bound in conscience vnto the fulfilling of the whole law

law for his Iustification.

This Proposition seemes very strange vnto our aduersaries & to be nothing else but a ground plot whereon to build all licentiousnesse and Libertinisme, as if wee did discharget men of all Allegiance to God and subiection to his law es. But their Calumnies are not sufficient confutations of orthodox doctrine: for the stopping of their mouthes we throwe them this distinction, whereon they may gnaw while they breake their teeth, before they bite it in peeces. Mans conscience stands bound vnto the law of God in a twofold obligation. Either

1 Of Obedience, that according to the measure of grace received, hee endeauour to the vtmost of his power to liue conformably to the Law of God in all things.

2 Of fulfilling the Law, that in every jot and tittle hee obserue all things whatsoeuer it commands vpon paine of everlasting condemnation for the least transgression.

We teach that no true beleeuere is freed from the Obligation vnto Obedience, but so farre as by grace giuen him hee is enabled, he ought to striue to the vtmost, to performe all duties towards God and man commanded in the law, if hee will iustifie his faith to be sound, without Hypocrisie. And ergo, our doctrine is no doctrine of licentiousnesse. But on the other side wee teach, that every true beleeuere is freed from that obligation vnto the fulfilling of the law; for the attaining of life and iustification by it. Which materiall difference for the clearing of our doctrine not obserued or rather suppressed by ^a Bellarmine, causeth the Jesuite to labour much in a nice dispuete, to proue against vs, That a Christian man is tied to the obseruation of the morall law. He tells vs that Christ is a law-giuere as well as a Redeemer of his Church, prescribing orders for all in common, for each one in

^a Lib. 4. de Iu.
sif. cap. 5.

particular

particular. That he is a Judge that sentenceth according to law. That he is a king that ruleth over subjects unto a law. That Christ by his comming did not destroy, but fulfill the law, expounded it and enioyned it to be obserued by vs. That his Apostles urge it in every Epistle. That a Christian man sinning offends against the law, and ergo is bound to keepe the law. In all which the Iesuite encounters his owne phantastic and not our doctrine which is not wounded by such misguided weapons. For we grant without striuing, *that every Christian is tied to obserue the morall law*, and we averre that *It is a most unchristian and Iesuiticall flaunder to affirme, as he doth, that we teach (Christianum b nulli legi obnoxium et b libidem. subiectum esse in conscientia coram Deo.)* Nay we teach that he is bound to obey to the vtmost of his power: and from this obligation no authority of man or Angell, Pope or Divell, can discharge him. So much wee grant the arguments alleaged by the Cardinall doe enforce, and nothing else. They proue Obedience necessary to a beleeving Christian: but they can never proue perfect fulfilling of the Law, to be necessarily required of him. From this heauy burthen Christ hath eased the shoulders of all such as are in him by a lively faith, of whom God doth no longer exact perfect Obedience to his law in those strict and rigorous termes, that they shall be accursed if they fulfill it not. This we proue by these Scriptures.

i Gal.5.1.2.3. (*Stand fast (saith the Apostle) in the liberty wherein Christ hath made vs free, and be not entangled againe with the yoake of bondage.*] But what is this yoake of bondage? Is it only the obseruation of the ceremoniall law? No. That was indeed part of the yeake which the Apostles sought to lay on the consciences of the Galatians. But 'twas the least and the lightest part, the weightiest burthen was

the fulfilling of the *morall law*, wherevnto by the doctrine of the false Apostles, the *Galatians* stood obliged. This is plaine by the Text in the words following. [*Behold, I Paul say unto you that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify againe to every man, which is circumcised, that he is bound to keepe the whole Law.*] The Apostles dispute is here evident. The *Galatians* may not be circumcised, nor obserue the *Ceremoniall law*. Why? Because if they did Christ should not profit them at all. But what reason is there for this, that *circumcision* and the *ceremonies* should frustrate the benefit of Christ's death? The Apostle alleageth a good reason, because the obseruation of the *Ceremoniall law*, tied them also to the fulfilling of the whole *morall law*. The Argument is thus framed.

They who are bound to keepe the whole law have no profit at all by Christ.

But they who are circumcised, are bound to keep the whole law. ergo,

They that be circumcised haue not profit at all in Christ.

The *minor* in this Argument is the expreſſe words of the Text, and the prooſe of it is evident in reaſon, because the retaining of *Legall ceremonies* did in effect abolish Christ's coiming in the flesh, who by his coiming in the flesh had abolished them. And *ergo*, they who in reviuing them, denied Christ's death, had no meanes at all to be ſaued: but onely by the fulfilling of the *morall law*. Wherevnto they were neceſſarily bound, if they meant not to perish. Which reaſon yet is of no force before Christ his coiming, and *ergo* then *circumcision* and other *legall ceremonies*, did not lay vpon the *Jewes* ſuch a ſtrict obligation to fulfill the whole law. The *Maior Proposition* is the very reaſon of the A- poſtles Enthymeme; thus. [*men circumcized are bound to keepe*



keepe the whole law: Ergo, Christ shall not profit them) The reason of the consequence is this Proposition, [Whoever are bound to keepe the whole law, Christ profiteth them nothing at all.] This Argument, and the reason thereof, will hardly passe with approbation in the Jesuites Schooles, [Men are bound to the whole law, ergo, Christ shall not profit them.] Nay, will they reply: that's a non sequitur. For by that doctrine, Christ's death hath cancelled that streight obligation off fulfilling the Law: but every one that belieues the promise of saluation in Christ, is yet notwithstanding obliged to fulfill the whole *moral law*. For this is (say they) the very condition wherevpon hee must haue benefit by the promise, euen (*Perfecta Mandatorum observatio:*) and therefore he is so farre from being freed by Christ from this obligation vnto the Law, that for a certaine, except hee fulfill it, he shall never be saued; as ^a^b Bellarmine peremptorily and bloodily determines. These men when they list are wondrous mercifull towards sinners, and can teach them *trickes*: by very easie meanes, to merit heauen and Remission of Sinnen. But their cruelty betraies their kindnesse in other matters; in as much as when all comes to the vpshot, a Sinner is driven to this. If he will be saued by Christ, hee must as he is bound, perfectly keep the whole Law: else there's no hope for him. This is cold comfort for the poore belieuer: but 'tis happy we haue not *Jesuits*, *Pharavhs taske-masters*, set ouer vs, to exact the whole tale of Brinke: but a *Jesus*, who hath freed our soules from this bitter thraldome and deliuering vs from the power of so rigorous and strict commands of the Law. We belieue an Apostle of Christ against all the *Syconians of Rome*, and tell them that they give the *holie Ghost* the lye, when they teach that in belieuers the obligation to keepe the whole law stands still in full force and vertue not

^a Lib. 4. cap. 2.
^b Lib. 4. cap. 7.
*(Si promissio
vita eterna, est
conditionata, ac
cap. 1. probantur
miserere ne-
cessarium est
implere condi-
tione, si quis sal-
lus fieri velit.)*
*Ego iustus non
est liber ab obli-
gatione Legis
divine: certe
nisi cum imple-
at non salvabitur.)*

in Christ Iesus, are freed from the necessity of perfectly fulfilling it, for the obtaining of saluation. But the law hath a coactiuē power ouer the vniust and vnbeleeuers, because they are obliged vnto the perfect fulfilling thereof, or else to bee certainly accursed. And *ergo* wee say the law commands ouer the iust as ouer sonnes requiring of them a faithfull and willing endeauerour: but it commands ouer the vniust, as ouer *Seruants*, of whom it exacts the vttermost farthing, and vpon the legall default threatens eternall male-diction. The difference then betwixt them and vs, is this. They make the coaction of the law to consist in the manner or quality of mans obedience to it. The law compels when men obey vnwillingly. Wee make the coaction of the law to consist in the quality of the command, and condition wherevpon obedience is required. The law then compels, when it exacts full obedience vpon penalty precisely threatned to the disobedient. Wherein the truth is manifestly on our side. For 'tis plaine, that compulsion in a Law must be taken in opposition to direction, not persuation, for lawes persuade not, but command. For if we speake properly a law cannot bee said to compell those, to whom 'tis giuen, as if by any reall and physical operation it did enforce them to obedience. It proposeth what is to bee done, it setteth before a man, the punishment for disobedience: but it workes not on the will of man, to force it one way, or other. Wherefore if we know what direction in a law is; we shall soone knowe what compulsion is. Direction (as all agree) is the bare prescription, of what is to bee done, or left vndone. Compulsion, that is, the exaction of obedience vpon penalty to be inflicted. What other coactiuē force there is in a law, no man can imagine. Well then to apply this. The iust are *sub directione Legis*: but not *sub coacione*. This must

So a King is
vnder the Di-
rection: not
the compulsi-
on of the law:
because not
tyed to the
Penalty.

must of necessity be understood thus; the iust are not vnder the coactiue power of Gods law, because it doth not exact of them full obedience vpon penalty of eternall death, to be otherwise inflicted on them. As it doth exact of the vniust. For otherwise there will be no difference betweene the iust and the vniust in regard of this coactiue power of the law, if both the one and the other be obliged to yeeld alike perfect obedience vpon the like penalty. In this case the Law will be as coactiue to one, as the other, exacting equall obedience, vpon equall termes, both of the iust and vniust. (viz) obey fully in all things: or you shall be cursed. The *sonne* and *Seruant* shall be all one, and the Law shall still command ouer the children, with as much terror, as ouer the Bondslaeue. There is no difference in the world; in our aduersaries doctrine, both sorts are bound to obey perfectly, or else certaintely they shall not be saued. So that the law of it selfe shall be as rigorous towards one as the other. But wee know the scriptures offer vnto vs more mercy: and that *Christ* hath discharged vs from this rigour of the Law, vnder which euery one, that is out of him in the state of vnbeleefe is holden in bondage. As to the difference they make (*the iust obey willingly, the vniust unwillingly, and ergo the Law compels these and not those*) this is nothing to the purpose. For it alters not the nature of the Law, that it is obeyed with diuerse affections. The Law is the same, for its command and authority; howsoeuer it be obeyed willingly or vnwillingly that matters not. The law ceaseth not to bee coactiue, because 'tis willingly obeyed: euen as a slauē ceaseth not to be vnder the coaction and compelling power of his Master, though he loue his master; and out of a willing minde be content to abide in thraldome. And as *Adam*, though he obeyed the law willingly; yet was vnder the co-

actiuē power of it; because he was tyed to obey it, or else he should certainly die the death for his transgression of it. Wherefore I conclude, that the iust are not freed from the Lawes direction, nor from the lawes compulsion, as it compels or enioynes them absolute obedience in all things, and for default therof threatens the vnavoidable malediction of Gods eternell wrath.

3 Lastly for proofe of this point wee haue those places formerly alleadged. Rom 6.14. [Wee are not under the law, but under grace.] Gal.5.18. [If wee be led by the spirit, wee are not under the law] 2,Cor.3.17. [Now the Lord is sbe, Spirit, and where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.] Gal.3.13. [Christ hath redeemed vs from the curse of the law, being made a curse for vs.] All which, with ^b other the like, doe establish this orthodox doctrine; That beleevers haue obtained freedome by Christ, from the rigour of the Morall law, and are not any longer bound in conscience to the perfect fulfilling thereof upon this assured perill, that if they keepe it not they shall not be saued. Wee might stand longer vpon each testimony: but let that which wee haue said, suffice for the vindicating of our conscience from that torture and bondage wherewith these Popish Doctors would ensnare vs. The knowledge of which our liberty, is not to giue vs occasion of security or licentiousnesse, as these men calumniate: but to restore peace and spirituall rest vnto our soules; knowing that wee are now deliuered from the necessity of obeying, or of perishing, which before we were in Christ, lay more heauy vpon our soules then a mountaine of lead. That so being freed from this thraldome, we might serue him who hath freed vs; thankfully, and chearefully, obeying him in all duty, by whom wee haue obtained this glorious priuiledge; that whereas perfect obedience was some

sometimes strictly exacted of vs: now our *sincere*, though imperfect indeauours, shall bee mercifully accepted at our hands.

SECT. 6 CHAP. I.

The reconciliation of that seeming opposition, between
S. Paul, & S. James in this point
of Inspiration.

Hus much of this Argument and of the first Branch of mans *Righteouſneſſe*, whereby if it were poſſible he ſhould be iuſtified, viz. *His Obedience to the law of God*. By which meanſ wee haue ſhewed no flesh ſhall be iuſtified in Gods ſight. Wee are to proceed vnto the next branch hereof, viz. *Mans ſatisfaction for his transgression of the law*. Wherin we haue alſo to proue, that a ſinner cannot be acquittēd before Gods iudgement ſeat, by pleading any *ſatisfaction*; that himſelfe can make for his offences.

But in our passing vnto that point wee are to give you warning of that stumbling stone which *S. James*, (as it may seeme) hath layed in our way: least any should dash his faith vpon it; and fall, as our adversaries haue done into that error of iustification by workes. That blessed *Apostle*, in the second chapter of his Epistle, seemes not only to give occasion: but directly to teach this doctrine of *Iustification* by workes. For in the 21. ver.&c, He saith expresselly, that *Abraham* was iustified by workes when hee offered his sonne *Isaucke* vpon the altar; & also that *Rahab* was in like manner iustified by workes, when she entertained the spies. Whence also he sets downe v.22. a generall Conclusion. *That a man is iustified by workes and not by faith alone.* Now in shew, no-

thing can be spoken more contrary to St. Paul his doctrine in his Epistle to the Romans and else-where. For in the 4.cap. speaking of the same example of Abraham, hee saith cleane contrary, that Abraham was not iustified by workes, *for then he might haue boasted ver. 2.* And in the 3.chap.treating generally of mans iustification, by faith; after a strong dispute he drawes forth this conclusion. *That a man is iustified by faith without the workes of the Law v. 28.* Which conclusion is in appearance contradictory to that of S. Iames. This harsh discord betweene these Apostles seemes vnto some, not possible to bee sweetned by any qualification, who knowing that the Holy Ghost never forgets himselfe haue concluded that if the spirit of truth speake by S. Paule, it was doubtlesse the spirit of error, that spake by the author of this Epistle of Iames. For this cause most likely it was doub-

ted of in ancient times, as ^a *Eusebius* and *Hierome* witness. But yet then also publikely allowed (*σεδίκησις εὐθύνη*) in many Churches, and euer since received in all : Out of which for the same cause *Luther* and others of his followers, since him would againe throw it forth, accounting the *author* of it to haue built no gold and siluer; but straw and stubble vpon the foundation. *Erasmus* assents to *Luther* and *Musculus* agrees with them both, who in his *commentaries* vpon the fourth to the *Romans*, speakes his minde simply, that he sees not how *James* and *Paul* can agree together, & therefore he turnes out S. *James* for the wrangler, supposing that this *James* was one of the Disciples of *James the Apostle*, the brother of *Christ* who vnder pretence of his *Masters* name and authority, continually snarled at the *Apostle Paul*, and opposed his doctrine. Howbeit his epistle got credit in after times, (*cum veritas paulatim inuolente mendacio procul- cari caperit.*) That is, When error by degrees preuailed a-

gainst the truth. But this medicine is worse then the disease, and is rather violence, then skill, thus to cut the knot where it cannot be readily vntied. A safer and milder course may be holden; and some meanes found out for the according of this grand difference without robbing the *Church* of so much pretious treasure, of diuine knowledge, as is stored vp in this Epistle. Wherefore both they of the *Romish* and wee of the reformed *Churches*, admitting this Epistle for canonical doe each of vs search after a fit reconciliation betweene the *Apostles*. But they and wee betweene our selues are irreconcileable in our seuerall reconciliations of them. They reconcile them thus. By distinguishing. I. of *Justification*.
2. of *Workes*. *Justification* (say they) is of two sorts.

- 1 The first when a man of *vnius* is made iust and hol-
ly, by the Infusion of grace, or the Habit of
charity.
- 2 The 2. When a man of *inst* is made more iust by the
augmentation of the Habit of grace first giuen vn-
to him.

Againe they diuide workes into two sorts.

- 1 Some goe before faith, being performed by the meere
strength of nature, & free will without the helpe of
grace and such workes as these are not meritorious.
- 2 Some follow faith, being performed by the aide and
assistance of grace giuen unto man: & such workes
as these be meritorious.

These distinctions prepared, the worke is now ready for the soldering, which they finish artificially glewing together the propositions of the two *Apostles* in this sort. S. Paul saith that *Abraham, and all men are iustified by faith without workes*. This (say they) is to be understood of the first *justification*, and of workes done before faith, without grace, by the

ſtrength of nature. So that the meaning of Paules propositi-
on (Abraham & all men, are inſtituted by faith without workeſ)
is this. Neither Abraham, nor any other can deserue the
Grace of Sanctification, whereby of unijust and unholie they
be made iust and holy, by any workeſ done by them, when they
are naturally men, deſtitute of grace, but only by faith in
Christ Ieſus, or thus. No man meriſt grace to make him a
good man of a bad, by any thing he doth before hee beleeue in
Christ; but by beleeuing hee obtaineth this. On the other ſide
S. James ſaith that (Abraham and all others are inſtituted by
workeſ, not by faith only.) this (ſay the Romaniſts) is meant
of the ſecond inſtitution, and of ſuch workeſ as are done
after faith, by the aide of grace: So the meaning of the Pro-
poſition ſhall be this. Abraham and other men being once
made good and iust, deserue to be made better, and more iust
by ſuch good workeſ as they perorme through the helpe of
Grace giuen unto them; and not by faith only. Being once
ſanctified, they deserue the encrease of ſanctification through
that merit of their faith, and good workeſ out of Faith and
Charity.

Is not this diſference betweene theſe Apoſtles finely accor-
ded thinke you? They will now walke together being in
this ſort made friends through the mediation of the Schoole-
men, but it is otherwise. They are fo farre from reconciling
them, that they haue abuſed them both, and ſet them far-
ther aſunder making them ſpeake what they neuer meant.
Neither in S. Paul, nor S. James is there any ground at all,
whereon to raife ſuch an interpretation of their words. And
therefore wee reſpect this reconcilement, as the ſhiftiſg
quercke of a Schoolemans braine, that hath no footing at all
in the text. Which wee doe vpon theſe reaſons.

I That diſtinction of Inſtitution (that is of ſanctifica-
tion)

tion) into the first gwing of it, and the after increase of it, (howsoeuer tollerable in other matters) is vtterly to no purpose, as it is applied vnto the doctrine of these *Apostles*. Who when they speake of *Iustification* of a sinner in Gods sight doe vnderstand thereby the *Remission* of *Sins* through the imputation of Christ's Righteousnesse and not the infusion, or increase of *inherent sanctity* in the soule of man. This confusion of *Iustification* with *sanctification* is a prime error of our aduersaries in this article, as hath beene shewed, in clearing the acceptations of the word *Iustification*: and shall be shewed more at large in handling the forme of our *Iustification*.

2. The distinction of *Iustification* taken in their owne sense is falsely applied to *S. James* as if hee spake of the 2 *Iustification*, and to *S. Paul* as if he spake of the first. For first ^a *Bellarmino* himselfe being iudge *S. James* in the example ^{a Lib. 4. de Iust. cap. 18.} *Rahab* speaks of the first *iustification*, because (as hee ^b Lorim in Iac. 2. faith) shee was then, at the first made a beleeuere of an infidell, a righteous woman of an harlot. And againe *Paul* hee speaks of the 2 *Iustification* in the example of *Abraham*, which is alleaged by both the *Apostles*. Her's then a confusione instead of a distinction. *Paul* speaks of the first, *James* speaks of the 2 and yet both doe speake of both *iustifications*. Againe when they say *James* speaks of the second *Iustification*, whereby of a iust man becomes more iust, tis a groundles imagination forasmuch as it was to no purpose for the *Apostle James* to treat of the second *Iustification*, whereby men grow better: when those *Hypocrites*, with whom hee had to doe, had erred from their first *iustification*, whereby they were not, as yet, made good, as hee learned ^b *Jackson* of *Iust. Faith.* *S. 2. cap. 6.* obserues. Nay there is not in all *S. James* his dispute, alay fillable, that may giue any iust suspition that by

^{a Loco supra citato.} *iustification*, he meanes the increase of inherent iustice. ^b Bel-larmine catcheth at the clause v. 22. (*By workes faith was made perfect*) which is, in the *Iesuits construction*, *Abrahams inherent iustice, begun by faith, received increase and perfection by his workes*) But this is only the *Iesuits phrenzie*. *Abraham* his faith and his Righteousnesse, whereof his faith is but a part, was not made but declared to be perfect, by so perfect a work which it brought forth, as, euen *Zorinus*, another of that *sect* expounds it *orthodoxly*.

3 Thirdly, that distinction of workes done before faith, without grace, & after faith by grace, is to as little purpose, as the former, in this matter of our *iustification*. Heretofore wee haue touched vpon that distinction and shewed the vanity thereof, in limiting Saint *Paul* to workes done without grace when simply he concludes all workes from our *iustification*. And *S. James* though hee require workes, of grace to bee ioyned with that faith which must iustifie vs: yet hee giues them not that place & office in our *Iustification*, from which *Paul* doth exclude them, and wherein our aduersaries would establish them, as it shall appeare anon.

Leauing then this *sophistical reconcilement* coined by our aduersaries I come to thole *reconciliations* which are made by our diuines, wherein we shall haue better *satisfacion* vpon better grounds. Two waies there are whereby this seeming difference is by our men reconciled.

i The 1. by distinguisheing the word (*iustification*)
 which may be taken either } 1 For the absolution of a Sinner
 } in Gods judgement.
 } 2 For the declaration of a mans
 } Righteousnesse before men.

This distinction is certaine and hath its ground in Scripture which vseth the word *iustifie* in both acceptions, for the

the quitting of vs in Gods sight, and for the manifestation of our innocency before man against accusation or suspition of faultinesse. They apply this distinction for the reconciling of the two *Apistles*. Thus. St. Paul speaks of *Iustification*, (*in foro Dei*) S. James speaks of *Iustification* (*in foro hominis*) *A man is iustified by faith without workes* saith S. Paul: that is in God's sight, a man obtaines *remission of Sinnes* and is reputed just only for his *Faith in Christ*, not for his workes sake. *A man is iustified by workes; and not by Faith only* saith S. James that is, in mans sight wee are declared to be iust by our good workes, not by our faith only: which with other inward and invisible graces, are made visible vnto man only in the good workes, which they see vs performe. That this application is not vnsit for to reconcile this difference, may be shewed by the parts.

1 For S. Paul 'tis agreed on all sides that hee speakes of mans iustification in Gods sight. Rom. 3.v.20.

2 For S. James we are to shew that with iust probability he may be vnderstood of the declaration of our *Iustification* and righteousness before men. For proove whereof the Text affords vs these reasons.

1 Verse. 18. *Show mee thy faith without thy workes & I will shew thee my faith by my workes.* Where the true Christian speaking to the *Hypocriticall* boaster of his faith, requires of him a declaration of his faith and *Iustification* thereby, by a reall prooufe, not a verball profession, promising for his part to manifest and approue the truth of his owne *Faith* by his good workes. Whence it appeares, that before man, none can iustifie the soundnesse of his faith: but by his workes thence proceeding. 2.V.21. *Abraham* is saied to be iustified when he offered vp his sonne *Isaack* vpon the *Altar*. Now 'tis manifest that *Abraham* was iustified in

Gods sight long before; eu'en. 25 yeares *Gen. 15.6.* Therefore by that admirable worke of his in offering his sonne he was declared before all the world to be a iust man & a true Beleeuer. And for this purpose did God tempt *Abraham* in that triall of his faith: that thereby all beleeuers, might behold a rare patterne of a liuely and iustifying Faith, and that *Abraham* was not without good cause called the father of the *faithfull*.

^a *Corin. 14.22.* It is said that *Abrahams faith* wrought with his worke and by workes was his *faith* made perfect. Which ^b *Bellarmino* in the iudgement of *popish Expositors* themselues, is to be understood of the manifestation of *Abrahams faith* by his workes. His *faith* directed his workes: his workes manifested the power and perfection of his *faith*.

^b *Lib. 4. cap. 18.*

It is not then without good probability of *Reason*, that *Calvin* and other *expositors* on our side, haue giuen this solution vnto this doubt. ^b *Bellarmino* labours against it and would faine proue that *iustification* cannot be taken here *pro declaracione iustitiae*. But his argument cannot much trouble any intelligent reader; and therefore I spare to trouble you with his *sophistry*.

This now is the first way of reconciling the places. Howbeit the truth is, that although this may bee defended against any thing that our aduersaries object to the contrary: yet many and those very learned diuines choose rather to tread in another path and more neerely to press the *Apostles* steps; whom also in this point I willingly follow.

2. The second way then of reconciling these places, is by distinguishing of the word (*Faith*) which is taken in a double sence.

^c *Gal. 5.6.*

1. First for that *faith*, which is true and living (*Picus d' Aylans iugurtha, Faith which worketh through love*) and

and is fruitfull in all manner of Obedience.

2. Secondly for that faith which is false and dead, being only a bare acknowledgement of the truth, of all articles of Religion accompanied with an outward formality of Profession: but yet destitute of sincere obedience.

This distinction of this word (*Faith*) is certaine by the *Scriptures*, as hath heretofore bin shewed in handling of that Grace. Our men now apply it thus *S.Paul* when he affirmes that wee are iustified by faith only, speaks of that faith which is true and liuing working by *Charity*. *S.James* when he denies a man is iustified by faith only, he disputes against that faith which is false and dead, without power to bring forth any good workes. So that the *Apostles* speake no contradictions, where *Paul* teacheth wee are iustified by a true *Faith*, and *S.James* affirmes wee are not iustified by a false *faith*. Againe *S.Paul* saith we are not iustified by works. *S.James* saith we are iustified by *Worke*s. Neither is, here any contradiction at all. For *S.James* vnderstands by *workes*, a (*working faith*) in opposition to the idle and dead faith before-spoken of (by a Metonymie of the effect.) Whence it is plaine that these two *Propositions* (*Wee are not iustified by workes*) which is *Pauls*, and (*We are iustified by a working Fath*) which is *James*, doe sweetly confort together. *Paul* seuers *Works* from our *iustification*, but not from our *Faith*. *James* ioyned workes to our *faith*, but not to our *Iustification*. To make this a little plainer by a *similitude* or twaine: there is great difference betweene these two sayings, (*A man liues by a reasonable soule*) and (*A man liues by Reason*.) The former is true, & shewes vs what qualities and power are *essentiall* vnto that *soule*, whereby a man liues. But the latter is false, because wee liue not by the quality, or power of *Reason*, though we liue by that *soule* which

hath that quality necessarily belonging to it, without which it is no *humane soule*. So also in these *Propositions*, (*Planta vivit per animam auctricem*) and (*Planta vivit per augmentationem*) each Party can tell that the former is true, & the other false. For although in the *Vegetine soule* whereby *Plantes* liue, there be necessarily required to the (*Being*) of it those 3 faculties of *Nourishment*, *Growth*, and *Procreation*: yet it is not the faculty of growing that giues life vnto *Plants*, for they liue when they grow not. In like manner. These two *Propositions* (*we are iustified by a working Faith*) and (*Wee are iustified by workes*) differ much. The first is true, and shewes vnto vs what *qualities* are necessarily required vnto the (*Being*) of that *Faith*, whereby the iust shall liue. Namely, that beside the power of beleeving in the promise, there be also an *Habituall pronenesse* and *Resolution* vnto the doing of all good *workes*, ioyned with it. But the later proposition is false. For although true faith bee equally as apt to worke in bringing forth *Vniversall Obedience to Gods will*; as it is apt to beleue and trust perfectly vnto God's promises; yet neuerthelesse wee are not iustified by it as it brings forth good workes; but as it embraceth the promises of the *Gospell*. Now then *James* affirms that which is true, that (*we are iustified by a working faith*) and *S. Paul* denies that which is false: viz. (*that wee are iustified by workes*).

CHAP.

C H A P. II.

The confirmation of the Orthodox reconciliation of S.

*Paul and S. James, by a Logicall Analysis
of S. James his disputation in
his second Chapter.*



His Reconciliation is the fairest, and hath the most certaine grounds in the text. It will, I doubt not, appeare so vnto you, when it shall be cleared from these cavills that can be made against it. There are but only two things in it that may occasion our aduersaries to quarrell. The first is touching the word (*Faith*) wee say that *S. James* speakes of a false and counterfeit faith. They say hee speakes of that which is true, though *Dead* without works. This is one point.^a

The second is touching the *interpretation* of the word (*Workes*) vsed by *S. James* when he saith, (*We are iustified by workes*) This wee interpret by a *Metonymy* of the *Effect* for the *Cause*, wee are iustified by a working faith, by that Faith which is apt to declare and shew it selfe in all good Workes. This interpretation may happily proue distastfull to their nicer *Palates*, who are very ready when it fits their humour, to grate sore vpon the bare words and letter of a text. These cavills remoued, this reconciliation will appeare to be sure and good. For the accomplishment of this I suppose nothing will be more commodious, then to present unto you a briefe resolution of the whole dispute of *S. James* touching *Faith*, that by a plaine and true exposition thereof we may more easily discouer the *cavills & sophistical forgeries* wherewith our aduersaries haue pestered this place of

^a *Bell. lib. 1. de Iust. cap. 15.*

Scripture. The disputation of S. James beginnes at the 14.v.
of the second Chapter to the end thereof.

The scope and summe whereof is. A sharpe reprobation of hypocriticall faith of vaine men as they are called (v. 20) Which in the Apostles time vnder pretence of Religion thought they might liue as they list. Two extreames there were, whercunto these Lewes, to whom the Apostle writes, were miſ-led by false teachers and their owne corruptions. The 1. That notwithstanding faith in Christ, they were bound to fulfill the whole law of Moses; Against which Paul disputes in his Epistle to the Gal. who also were infected with that Leauen. The other was, that Faith in Christ was sufficient without any regard of obedience , to the law: so they beleueed the Gospell, acknowledging the Articles of Religion for true, & made an outward profession all should be well, albeit in the meane time sanctity and sincere Obedience were quite neglected. The former error brought them in bondage : this made them licentious. A pleasing heresy if any other, whereof there were and will bee alwaies store of sectaries who content themselues to haue a forme of Godlinesse, but deny the power thereof. Against such hypocrites and vaine Boasters of false Faith and false Religion, S. James disputes in this place, shewing plainly that such men leaned on a ſtoffe of Reed, deceiuing their owne ſelues with a counterfeiit and shadow of true Christian Faith instead of the ſubſtance. The reprooſe with the maine Reason is expressed by way of interrogatiōn in the (14.v.) what doth it profit my brethren , though a man ſay he haue faith (as many then did, & alwaies will ſay, boasting falsely of that which they haue not iu truth,) And haue not workes; that is, Obedience to Gods Will, whereby to approoue that Faith he boasts of? Can that Faith ſave him? Is that faith without

without Workes a ſauing Faith that will bring a Man to Heaven? These Sharpe Interrogations must be resolued into their strong Negations. And ſo wee haue these two Propofitions. 1 Containing the maine ſumme of the *Apoſtles* diſpute: The other a generall Reason of it. The 1 is this. *Faith without Obedience is unprofitable.* The ſecond prouing the ^{1 Arg. of S.} *Iameſ,* first, is this. *Faith without Obedience will not ſave a Man.* The whole Argument is.

*That Faith which will not ſave a man is unprofitable,
of no uſe.*

*But the Faith which is without obedience will not
ſave: Ergo*

Faith without obedience is unprofitable.

The Major of this Argument will eafilie be graunted. *That it is an unprofitable faith which will not bring a man to life and Happines.* But how doth S. James proue the Minor. *That a faith without workes will not doe that?* though it ſcarſe need any prooſe: yet because *Hypocracie* is euer armed with *Sophiſtrie*, for a plainer Conviction, the *Apoſtle* proues it by this manner of Argumentation.

That faith which ſaves a man is a true faith.

But a Faith without workes is not a true faith. Ergo

A Faith without workes will not ſave man.

The Major is evident to all that haue Reasons. The Minor S. James proues by diuerſe Arguments.

1. The firſt is contained v. 15. 16. 17. and it is drawne ^{apari}, from comparison with another like vertue. Namely *Charity* towards the poore. The Argument is thus. If *Charity* towards the poore profeffed in words, but without workes be counterfeite, then *Faith in God profeffed in like manner without Obedience* is alſo counterfeite not true. But *Charity* towards the poore in words profeffed without deeds is a coun-
terfeite

terficit charity. Ergo; Faith in God without obedience is a counterfeit and false faith.

The Reason of the major proposition is evident, from the similitude that is betweene all vertues and graces. There is no vertue, but men may counterfeit and falsely arrogate it to themselves, as they may boast of a false faith, so also (as Solomon and experience speakes) of a false liberality, false Valour, false Prudence, &c. Now there is but one way to discouer this counterfeiting in any kind, and that is to goe from wordes to workes, from presumptions and boastings to actions. This way all count most certaine, nor will any man beleue words against workes, or be persuaded by faire speeches, that the habites of vertues and graces bee truely feated in his mind, whose tongue tells vs they be so: but his doings confute his sayings. Wherefore the Apostle in his comparison proceeds on an vndeniable ground. Now for the minor (that the charity which is rich in good words, and poore in almesdeeds, is not true but counterfeit pity) the Apostle shewes by an ordinary instance (If a brother or sister be naked or destitute of daily food) that is. If a beleeuing Christian want food and raiment or other necessaries (and one of you say unto them, depart in peace, and be ye warmed & filled) If he giue him kinde words, Alas poore soule I pitthy thee and wish thee well, I would I had to giue thee, goe in Gods name where thou mayest be relieved, & so let him passe with a few pittifull complements, notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needfull for the body: what doth it profit. Is the poore mans backe euer the warmer? Or his belly the fuller, with a few windy complements? Can such a man perwade any that hee hath in him indeed the bowells of mercy and compassion towards the needy, when they find such cold entertainment at his gates. Tis manifest

that

that this is but a meere mockery, and that such pittifull words come not from a heart that's truely mercifull. The Apostle now applies this touching *Charity*, vnto *Faith*.
 v.17. *Euen so faith if it haue not workes is dead being alone.* As that *Charity*, so also that *Faith* which men professe without obedience is false and fained, and therefore vnprofitable to sauе a man. *It is dead.* How must this be vnderstood? *Faith* is a quality of the soule, & qualities are then said to be dead, when they are extinguished. As if we should say such a mans *Charity* is dead; it is because he hath lost it; that which was in him is abolished. But this is not the meaning. For then when S. James saith *that faith is dead being alone*: his meaning should bee that *Faith* seuered from *Workes*, *is no faith at all: but quite extinguished.* Now this is not so: For theres a *Faith* seuered from *Workes* in *Hypocrites*, *Heretiques*, *Reprobates* and *Diuells*. Which *Faith* is a generall assent to all diuine truthes: and this *Faith* in them hath a true being, but no sauing vse. Wherfore it is called a dead faith in regard of the effect: because 'tis nothing auailable to bring them, in whom it is, to life and Saluation, as a true and liuing faith is. Here our aduersaries haue much strange contemplation, telling vs that *Faith* without workes though it be a dead faish, yet 'tis a true *faith*. Euen as an instrument is a true instrument, though it be not vsed. So that in their *Philosophy* 'tis one and the same true *Faith* which is dead without, and liuing with workes. Euen as 'tis one and the same Body which liues with the soule & is dead without it: or as water is the same whether it stand still in a *Cesterne* or runne in a *Riner*. Whence they proceed to discourse that *Charity* is the forme of *faith*: & conclude that it is not the *inward and Essentiall forme* of it, as the *soule* is the forme of a man (for that *workes* are not *essenti-*
all)

all to Faith) nor the accidentall forme as whitenesse is of Paper; because faith according to their Schooles, is in the vnderstanding, and Charity in the will: But it is the externall Forme of it, because it giues to Faith a merit and worthinesse for the deteruynge of Heauen. These fond ſpeculations of the forme and merit of Faith I passe by now, hauing touched vpon them heretofore. To that which they ſay. That a liuing faith, and a dead Faith is one & the ſame true faith: tis vtterly false, they differ as much as light and darkneſſe.

1. In their ſubiect, a dead faith is in the Reprobate Man & Diuels. A liuing faith only in the Elect: 2. In their Objecit. A dead Faith affents to diuine Revelations as barely true or good onely in the generall: a liuing faith affents to them, as truer and better in themſelues; then any thing that can be ſet againſt them. 3 in their nature. A dead faith is no ſanctifying Grace: but a common gift of creation as in the diuell, of ordinary illumination as in Reprobate men. A liuing faith is a ſanctifying grace, a part of inherent holinesſe wrought in the heart by the ſpeciall power of the Holy Ghost. All which haue bin heretofore cleared in handling the Nature of Faith. Wherefore vnto thoſe arguments or Sophismes

¶ Lib. 1. de Inf. cap. 15.

rather, which a Bellarmine brings to proue that James ſpeakes of a true diuine, iuſtified, Catholique, Christian Faith, though it be dead faith; I anſwere briefly. That we grant a dead faith to be a true faith: but it is in its kind. Because it hath a true being in men and diuels, in whom it is, and tis directed toward true objeicts: But it is not that true Faith which is Catholique Christian and ſauing. This is of another kinde, and in comparison of this, that other is but a meere ſhaddow and conterfeit reſemblance of true Faith. Wherefore when thoſe Hypocrites accounted themſelues to haue that faith which is truely Christian and ſauing, s.

James

*James shewes them that this their faith which was alone naked of obedience, was nothing so : but a *Faith* of another kind, a dead *faith*, hauing onely a false shew of a true and liuing *faith*. This of the first Argument.*

2 The 2^d Argument is contained v. 18. being drawne 2 Arg. of S. from an impossibility, in prouing the truth of it. The argument stands thus.

That faith, which is truly Christian may be shewen and proued so to be.

But a faith without workes cannot bee demonstratck to be a true faith.

Ergo. A Faith without workes is no true Faith.

The maior is omitted as most evident of it selfe. Because there is no *morall* vertue, or grace of the *Holy Ghost* truly planted in the heart : but it may be knowne by some exterrnall actions, which it is apt to bring forth. Euen as life is knowne by breathing, or beating of the *Pulse*. The truth of an inuisible grace hath its demonstration in visible workes. But now for the *Minor S. James* proues that faith without obedience cannot appeare by any prooef to be true faith. Which he doth in a dialogue betweene a true beleauer and a *Hypocrite*. *Yea a man may say, thou hast faith, and I haue Workes shew mee thy faith without workes, and I will shew thee my faith by my workes.* That is. Thou saiest thou hast a true faith, though thou hast no workes: I say I haue true faith because I haue workes. Come wee now to the triall, and let it appeare who saith true, thou or I. If thou saiest true, proue thy faith by something or other to be true. Shew me thy faith ^b without thy workes. Workes thou hast none, whereby to shew thy faith, make it then appeare by something else. But thats impossible. Where workes are wanting, ther's no demonstration else wherby to iustifie the ^c *truth*.

truth of *faith*. And therefore thou art driuen to confesse that thou vainely boastest of that which thou haſt not. But on the other ſide (laith the true beleueuer) I can make good, that which I ſay, prouing that my *faith* is true by my works, *I will ſhew thee my faith by my workes.* My ſincere Obedience is a reall demonstration: that my beleife is no verball oſtentation and vaine bragge. This prooſe of S. *James* is verily conuincing, and gripes the *Conſciences* of Hypocrites, ſmiting them with shame and conuention when they come to this triall; and ſo haue their false and fraudulent hearts laid open. But here it will bee asked what workes doe demonstrate the truth of *faith*, and also how they doe proue it. Whereto we anſwere workes are of two ſorts. 1 *Ordinarily*, ſuch workes of *Sanctity* and *Obedience*, as are required to a holy *Conuerſation*. 2 *Extraordinarily*. viz. *Miracles*. Wee ſay S. *James* underſtands the former, and thofe only: our adverſaries conclude both. But erroneouſly, for almuch as S. *James* ſpeakes not of the doctrine of *faith*, but of the grace of *faith*. The grace requires good workes of *Piety* and *Charity* as perpetually neceſſary for the confirmation of its truth. So doth not the doctrine of *faith* alwaies require *Miraculous workes* for the confirmation of its diuinity: But onely at the firſt publication thereof. Wherefore *Lorinus* is very ridiculous, who vpon this place tells vs, that they may iustly deauaund of vs *Heretiques* (For ſo they beduſt vs) *Miracles* for the confirmation of our new and false doctrine. Indeed were it new & false their request were not vnaſonable, that wee ſhould make our doctrine credible by doing of miracles. But ſure the *Jeſuite* iudgeth of our doctrine by his owne, which did he not ſuſpect for a new error, wee ſee no reaſon they ſhould ſtill require *miracles* for confirmation of *an olde truthe* for our ſelves we ſeekē not the aide of a lying wonder.

wonder to vphold a true doctrine: nor doe wee count it any disgrace at all to our religion, that we cannot by our faith so much as cure a lame horse, as the *Jesuite* out of a *Eras*. scoffs at vs. Now surely if such a beast as *Bellarmino's* devout ^{a Delib. arbit.} Mare, want helpe to set her on all foure, we cannot bee yet so well perswaded of that vertue of *Romish faith*, as to think that a *Frier* will doe more good at such a jadish miracle, then a *Farrier*. But whereas the *Jesuite* goes forward to require of vs the other sort of good works, of *Piety & Charity* for the demonstration of our faith he hath reason so to doe, though not so much as he imagines, when hee chargeth vs with neglect of good works and vnbridled licentiousnesse: Would to God we could cleare our practise from such neglect, as well as we can our doctrine from teaching it. But yet by their fauour, if we come to comparison, we know no reaſon why we ſhould runne behinde the dore, as more ashamed of our practises, then they may iustly bee of theirs, in which caſe we boldly bid him amongst them, that is without ſinne to cast the firſt ſtone at vs. To proceed. Seeing workes of obedience are the *proofes* of a true *Faith*, it muſt be conſidered in what ſort they proue it. For may not good workes be counterfeited as well as Faith? I anſwere. That in this triall the iudgement of *verity* and *infallibility* belongeth vnto God, who only knowes the heart and conſcience, being able to diſcerne euery ſecret working of the ſoule, and ſo to iudge exa&ctly whether or no all outward appearances come from inward *ſincerity*. But for the iudgement of *Charity* that belongs to vs. If wee behold in any man the Workes of obedience to Gods will; of ſuch a man we are to iudge that he hath true *Faith*. Though yet herein we muſt as farre as humane frailty will giue leauē, iudge alſo not according to appearance, but judge righteous iudgement.

ment. Mens practices must be examined : if *hypocrisie* be wray it selfe(as 'tis hard for a *Counterfeite* not to forget himselfe at some one time or other, if he be duly obserued) there *Charity* must not be blinde: it must see and censure it. 'Tis not a charitable, but a peruerse iudgement to call euil good: nor is it any offence to call that a barren or bad tree , that beares either no fruit at all, or none but bad ; And thus of this second *Argument* of the *Apostle*, that these *Hypocrites* *faith* was vaine,because,when it comes to the prooфе, it cannot be iustified to be found and good.

3 The third Argument is v. 19. from the example of the Diuels themselues , in whom there is a faith without workes,as well as in *hypocrites*: and *ergo* it is in neither of them a true Faith. The Argument is brought in to confute a cauill which the *hypocrite* might make against the former reason. True might he say, I cannot shew my *Faith* by my workes: yet for all that I haue a true faith. And why ? Because I beleue the Articles of *Religion* , that there is one God,with the rest. Hereto the Apostle replies. That such a beliefe is not a true *Christian faith*,because it is to be found eu'en in the Diuels. The Argument runnes thus.

That faith which is in the Diuels is no true Christian Faith.

But a bare assent to the Articles of Religion without Obedience is in the Diuels. Ergo.

A bare assent without obedience is no true Christian Faith.

The *Major* of this *Argument* will easily be granted. That the Diuels haue not that true Faith which is required of a *Christian Man* to his saluation. The *Minor* is also evident. That the diuels doe beleue the Articles of *Christian Religion*. *S. James* instances in one for the rest,namely the *Article* of

of the Godhead, whereto the diuels affent as well as *Hypocritical men*. *Thou believest that there is one God*, faith the true belieuer to the *hypocrite*, pleading that hee belieueth the Articles of faith. *Thou doest well*. 'Tis a laudable and good thing to acknowledge the truth of Religion. But withall thou must knowe that the diuels deserue as much commendation for this beleefe, as thou doest. *The Diuels also believe*. Euen they confesse the truth of that and the other *Articles of Religion*. An evident prooſe whereof is this, that *they tremble* at the power, wrath, and iustice of God, and the remembrance of the last iudgement, which did they not belieue, they would not feare: but now they expect it with horrour, because they knowe it will come vpon them. Whence 'tis plaine that the Faith of *Hypocrites* and *Diuels* is all one, neither better then other, both vnsfruitfull to bring forth obedience, both vnprofitable to bring vnto salvation, and therefore neither of them that true faith, which is *Christian* and sauing. This argument of the *Apostle*, pincheth our Aduersaries sore, who stiffely maintaine that *S. James* speaks of a true, though of a dead faith. For they cannot for shame say that there is a true faith in the diuels & damned Spirits. But yet *S. James* hath concluded that they haue that dead faith which *Hypocrites* boast of. What then? Then a dead faith is no true faith, as our aduersaries affirme it is. Wherefore to helpe themselues, they deny that it is one & a Fell.lib.1. de iufif.cap.15. the same dead faith, which is in Hypocrites and euill Spirits. Indeed *ex parte objecti*, they grant that the faith of diuels is as true and *catholique* as that of wicked men, because they both believe the same things. And also in regard of the *effects*, they grant their faith to be alike, because both bee vnsfruitfull. But not *ex parte subjecti*, so they say there's much difference. The faith of diuels is of one sort, and the faith of *Hypocrites*

Hypocrites of another. But here they make a little to bold with the blessed *Apostle*, ouerturning the force of his argument, to vphold their owne fancy. The *Apostle* proues against *Hypocrites* that their idle faith without obedience is not true sauing faith. Why? Because the diuels idle faith destitute of obedience is no true sauing faith. But now. Is the faith of diuels and hypocrites of the same kinde and nature, Yea, or no? No, they be not, they be of a diuerse nature, say the aduersaries. Let it be then considered, what force there is in the *Apostles* argument, *Faith without workes in diuels saues them not. Ergo faith without workes in wicked men, saues them not.* Might not one prompted by a *Iesuite*, reply vpon the *Apostle*. Nay by your leauue, your argument is inconsequenter, because you doe not dispute, *ad idem*. Faith in the diuels is of one kinde, Faith in *Hypocrites* is of another: and therefore though faith without workes cannot saue diuels; yet faith without workes may saue men. Thus were the *Apostles* argument laid in the dust, if these mens opinions may stand for good. But would you knowe what distinction these men make betweene the faith of Diuels and wicked men, which *S. James* takes for the same. Tis thus. First the faith of euill men is free, the faith of diuels is compelled and extorted from them by a kinde of force. So ^b *Bellarmino*

hys supra.

[*Fides hominum malorum libera est, captivante nimis
piè voluntate intellectum in obsequium Christi: Fides vero
Demonum est coacta, & extracta ab ipsa rerum evidentiâ.
Quod insinuanit idem Iacobus dicens. Demones credunt, &
contremiscunt. Nos enim non credimus contremiscentes, id
est, inviti & coacti, sed sponte & libenter.* Wicked men believe freely and willingly. Why? Because their pious and godly will captiuates their vnderstanding to the obedience of *Christ*, so causing it to assent vnto the truth. The Diuels belieue

beleeue vpon compulsion , being forced to it by the evidence of the things themselues. Which Saint James intinates, *They beleeue and tremble*: that is, they beleeue against their wills. Is not this a shamelesse *Jesuite* that will say any thing to patch vp a broken cause? For bee not these absurd contradictions to say, that wicked men haue godly wills, that by a pious motion of the will , their vnderstanding is captivated,to the obedience of Christ, and yet they be *hypocrites* and wicked men still. No man can relish such assertions; who knowes how averse and froward the will of men is to embrase any thing that is of God, till such time as it be regenerat by sanctifying grace. It is therefore without all reason, to affirme that wicked men beleeue willingly, and 'tis against all experiance, which shewes that vngodly men are vtterly as vnwilling to beleeue any truth that makes against them in any kinde whatsoeuer ; as a *Beare* is to bee brought to the *stake*. Indeed in matters that like them, or such as bee of an indifferent nature , neither fauoring nor crossing their corruptions, they'll be apt to beleeue, though not out of a pious affection, as the *Jesuite* dreames : but out of selfe-loue and other *selfe considerations*. But take them in any other point of Religion, that doth any way grate vpon their wicked affections, all the perswasion and instruction in the world, can not worke them to a beleife of it, till the *Conscience* (spite of their hearts) bee conuicted by some notable evidence of the truth. Now what else can be said of the diuels ; who will as willingly believe what makes for them, (if any thing did) or what makes not against them; as any wicked man can doe ? And they are as vnwilling to believe any thing, that makes against them, as any wicked man is. Nor would they beleeue it, did not the cleerenesse of diuine *Reuelations* convince them of the certaine truth thereof. So that there is no
D d difference,

Because.

difference at all in this respect , as the one , so the other belieue vnwillingly; as diuell's , so wicked men belieue with trembling. The diuels indeed with greater horror , as their beleefe and knowledge is alwaies more distinct then Mans: but yet men with horror too, when their consciences by fits are awakned to behold the woes , that are comming vpon them. Vnto this difference of Bellarmine *others adde two more.* Namely: 1 *That the faith of diuels is naturall, that of wicked men supernaturall and infused.* 2 *That the faith of diuels is dishonest, the faith of wicked men is an honest faith.* Whereto we say thus much. That touching the first difference, we grant indeed that the Faith of the diuels is not supernaturall except it be in regard of the object. The facultiess which they received in their creation are not so far corrupted in them: but that they are able to assent vnto, and apprehend diuine revelations without further helpe , then of their owne naturall abilities. Man in his fall sustained greater losse in the spirituall powers of his soule , and therefore stands in need of helpe. Which helpe is afforded even vnto the vngodly; but this is by ordinary illumination , not by speciaall infusion of any sanctifying grace. Enlightned they are aboue the ordinary pitch of naturall blindnesse: but not aboue that whereto a meere naturall vnderstanding may be aduanced. Yea were mans vnderstanding raised vp to that perfection which is in diuels : this were more then Nature, yet lesse then grace. This common gift of illumination bestowed on wicked men, but not on diuell's, is no proofe that their faith is of a diuerse kinde. As to the last difference we are not so fatre studie in moralities,as to conceiue wherein the dishonesty of the diuel's faith, and the honesty of Hypocrites faith doth lye. To ordinary vnderstanding it seemes every way as honest and commendable a matter , for a wicked

ked fiend, as for a wicked man, to beleive what God reveals vnto him. If not, we must expect to bee further informed by these *Iesuites, men* that are better read in that part of *Ethicks* whether diabolicall or hypocriticall.

4 This of the *Apostles* third Argument. We come to ^{4 Arg. of S.}
the fourth. ^{Iames.}

The fourth Argument is contained in the 20, 21, 22, 23, 24
25. verses. Before which the *Apostle* repeates his maine con-

clusion. That faith without obedience is a false & dead faith.

Bat wile thou knowe, O^a vaine man (or hypocrite,) that faith without workes is dead? v. 20. For the convincing of him fur-
ther, hee proceeds to a new Argument to proue it vnto him.

The Argument is this.

*That faith which will not iustifie a man is a false & dead
faith.*

*But the faith which is without workes will not iustifie
a Man. Ergo*

Tis a dead and a false faith.

The Major the *Apostle* omits as most evident of it selfe.
The Minor hee proues by an induction of two Examples.
Thus.

*If Abraham and Rahab were iustified by a working
faith, then that faith which is alone without workes
will not iustifie.*

*But Abraham and Rahab were so iustified, viz. by a
working faith. Ergo*

Faith without workes will not iustifie a man.

The reason of the consequence is manifest. Because as *A-
braham & Rahab*: to all other must be iustified. The meanes
of iustification and life, were euer one and the same for all
men. Which also the *Apostle* intimates in that clause v. 21.
Was not our father Abraham, &c. implying that as the Fa-

ther, so also the children, the whole stocke and generation of the Faithfull , were and are still iustified by one vniforme meanes. The two instances the Apostle vrges, that of *Abraham*, v. 21. 22. 23. that of *Rahab*, v. 25. The conclusion which equally issues from them both, hee interlerts in the middest, after the allegation of *Abrahams example*, v. 24. I shall goe ouer them as they lye in the Text.

In the example of *Abraham*, the Apostle v. 21. sets downe this proposition. *That Abraham was iustified by a working faith.* For this interrogative: *Was not our father Abraham iustified by workes?* Mult bee resolued into an affirmative *Abraham our father was iustified by workes.* That is a *working faith.* Which proposition the Apostle confirmeth by it's parts. 1. Shewing that *Abrahams* faith was an operatiue faith declared and approued by his workes. Secondly, proving that by such a working faith *Abraham* was iustified in God's sight. That the faith of *Abraham* was operative, full of life and power to bring forth *Obedience* vnto God , the Apostle alleageth one instance instead of all the rest to prove it. And that is that singular worke of *Obedience* vnto Gods command. *When hee offered vp his sonne Isaack vpon the Altar.* Many other workes there were performed by *Abraham* abundantly iustifying the truth of his faith: But the Apostle chooseth this aboue all other, as that worke which was of purpose enioyned him by God for a triall of his faith. Wherin *Abraham* mightily ouercomming all those strong temptations to disobedience & infidelity, made it appeare, that his faith was not an idle, dead, and empty *Speculation*, but an active and working grace. Wherefore the Apostle addes, v. 22. *Seest thou how faith wrought with his workes, and by workes was faith made perfect?* That is, as in other workes of that holy Patriarch, so specially in that sacrificing his

his son, all that can see, may plainly behold, the strength & life of his faith. *Faith wrought with his workes.* That is, His faith directed & supported him in the doing of that work, as the Apostle Paul expounds it, *Heb. 11.17.* *By faith Abraham offered vp Isaack:* that worke had not beeene done, if faith had not wrought it. In every circumstance thereof faith did all in all from the beginning of the worke to the end. This interpretation is most simple and generally received. *Faith wrought with:* That is, In or by his workes, vnto the performance wherof the force of faith was in speciaill manner assyning. *Pareus* reads the words by a ^a *tmesis.* ^a As in other words vsed by this Apostle (*1csl.*) τὸν διατελεῖν, i.e. *Faith being with his workes wrought.* viz. *καταστήσας τὴν διατελείαν.* ^b As the *An-*
what? his Iustification. But his construction seemes some-
2.v.6. καταστήσας τὴν διατελείαν.
v.13. καταστήσας τὴν διατελείαν.
xi. h 4. 11.
b. As the An-
obey. The *Apostle* goes forward, *And by workes was faith made perfect.* That is declared to bee perfect. ^b For workes did not perfect *Abrahams* *faith essentially,* inasmuch as long before this time, it was perfect, as is plaine in that *Abraham* was iustified by it 25 yeares before the oblation of his sonne *Isaack,* and also by the strength of his faith had done many excellent workes and obtained great blessings at the hand of God. So that the offering vp of *Isaack* was not the cause but a fruite of the perfection of *Abrahams* *faith,* the great difficulty of that worke shewed the singular perfection of that *Grace* which was able so to encounter and conquer it. The goodnessse of the fruite doth not worke, but declare the goodnessse that is in the tree; the qualities of the fruits alwaies depending vpon the nature of the tree: but not on the
Now i knowe that thou fea-
rest God: see-
ing or my
like thou hast
not spared
thine onely
sonne.

contrary. Thus then the first part of the proposition is plainly proued by the *Apostle*. That *Abrahams* Faith was a lively and working Faith declaring and approuing its own truth by the works of his *Obedience*.

The next part. Namely. *That Abraham was iustified in Gods sight, by such a working faith,* he proues. 1. By a Testimony of Scripture. 2. By an effect or consequent thereof. Both are expressed in the 23.v. The first in these words. *And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham belieued God, and it was imputed vnto him for righteousness.* The application of this testimony is very heedfully to bee obserued, because it serues excellently for the clearing of the *Apostles* meaning, when hee saith wee are iustified by workes. *And the Scripture was fulfilled* saith *S. James.* When? At the time that *Isaack* was offered. But was it not fulfilled before that time? Yes. Many yeares, when the promise of the blessed seed was made vnto him, as appeares Gen. 15. 6. Wence this testimony is taken. How was it then fulfilled at the oblation of *Isaack*? Thus. The truth of that which was verified before, was then againe confirmed by a new and evident experiment. Well. Thus much is plaine enough. But here now the difficulty is, how this Scripture is applied vnro the *Apostles* former dispute. In the 21.v. He saith that *Abraham* was iustified by Workes when hee offered *Isaack*. How proues he, that he was so iustified? Why by this testimony. Because the Scripture was fulfilled at that time, which saith, *Abraham belieued God, &c.* Marke then the *Apostles* argument. *When Abraham offered Isaack the scripture was fulfilled which saith Abraham was iustified by faith.* For that's the meaning of that Scripture. Ergo, *Abraham when hee offered Isaack was iustified by workes.* This at first sight seemeth farre set, and not onely besides, but quite contrary

c. *Apostle's* purpose to prove hee was then iustified by
ces, because the scripture saith, he was then iustified by
b. But vpon due consideration, the inference appears
: evident, and the agreement easie, The *Apostle* and
Scripture alleged, haue one and the same meaning:
Scripture saith. He was iustified by faith, meaning, as
infesse, a working faith fruitfull in obedience. S. *James*
nes the very same, saying, that hee was iustified by
ces, that is *Metonymically* by a working faith. And there-
the *Apostle* rightly alleadgeth the Scripture for confir-
on of his assertion: the Scripture witnesssing. *That by*
h he was iustified, the *Apostle* expounding what man-
if *Faith* it meanes. Namely a faith with workes or a
king faith. So that the *application* of this testimony vnto
time of offering vp of *Isaack* is most excellent: because
it appeared manifestly what manner offaith it was,
before God had accounted him iust in former times.
bout this *Metonymy* it appeares not, that there is any
: in the application of this Scripture and the argument
thence. The Scripture witnesseth that *Abraham* was
iustified by Faith. *Ergo* tis true, that he was then iustifi-
y workes. What *consequence* is there in this argument
pt wee expound S. *James* by that *metonimic*, Workes,
is a working *Faith*? And so the argument holds firme.
: it otherwise, as our aduersaries would haue it, or, to
ke truth, according to the former interpretation of our
ies; it breeds an absurd construction either way. *Abra-*
in offering *Isaack* was iustified by workes that is, *secunda*
ficatione of good hee was made better. How is that
ied? By scripture. Because the *Scripture* saith. That
at time he was iustified by faith. That is, *prima Iustifi-*
me of bad he became good. Is not this most apparent

Non-sence. Againe according to the interpretation s of our
divines, *Abraham* at the offering vp of *Isaack* was iustifi-
ed by workes (that is, say they) declared iust before men.
How is that proued? By Scripture. Because the Scripture
saith. That at that time, he was iustified by faith. That is,
accounted iust in Gods sight. In which kinde of arguing I
must confess I apprehend not how there is any tolerable
consequence. Wherfore wee expound S. *James* *metony-*
mically, putting the *effect* for the *cause*, workes, for a work-
ing faith, as the necessary connexion of the text enforceth
vs. Not is there any harilnesse at all, nor violent straining in
this figure, when two things of necessary and neere depen-
dance one vpon the other, (*as workes, and a working faith*)
are put one for another. Neither haue our aduersaries more
cause to complaine of vs for this figuratiue interpretation
of workes, then we haue of them for their figuratiue inter-
pretation of faith. For when wee are saied to be iustified by
faith, they vnderstand it *dispositione & meritorie* not for-
maliter *faith* in it selfe is not our sanctification, nor yet the
cause of it. But it merits the bestowing of it, and disposeth
vs to receive it. Let reason iudge now, which is the harsher
exposition. Theirs? *Faith iustifies*(that is) *Faith is a dispo-*
sition in vs desiruing that God shoulde sanctifie vs by infusion
of the habit of Charity. Or ours? *Workes iustifie*, that is, *the*
Faith whereby wee are acquited in Gods sight, is a working
Faith. Thus much of this Testimony of Scripture pro-
uing that *Abraham* was iustified by a true and work-
ing *Faith.*

In the next place the *Apostle* shewes it by a visible effect
or Consequent that followed vpon his iustification expressed
in the next words: *And bee was called the friend of God.* A
high prerogatiue, for God the Creator to reckon of a poore
mortall

*mortal man as his familiar friend ; but so entire & true was the faith of Abraham, so upright was his heart , that God not only gratiouly accounted it to him for Righteousnesse: but also in token of that gratiou acceptance entered into a league with Abraham taking him for his especiall friend and confederate ; A league offensiu and defensiu. God would be a friend to Abraham [*Thou shalt be a blessing*] & a friend of Abrahams friends. *I will blesse them that blesse thee;* and an enimie of Abrahams enimies : *I will curse them that curse thee.* Which league of friendship with Abraham before the offering vp of Isaac was therevpon by solemn protestation and oath renued , as wee haue it, *Gen.22.verse 16. &c.**

Thus wee haue this first example of *Abraham*. From thence the *Apostle* proceeds to a generall conclusion in the next verse (24) *Ye see then how that by workes a man is iustified, and not by faith only.* That is , therefore it is evident. That a man is iustified by a working faith : not by a faith without workes. Which *Metonymicall* interpretation is againe confirmed by the inference of this conclusion vpon the former verse. The scripture saith, *That Abraham beleaved God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.* *Ergo* (saith *S. James*) *Ye see how a man is iustified by workes, and not by faith only.* A man might here say. Nay rather. We see the contrary. That a man is iustified by faith only and not by workes. For in that place of Scripture there is no mention at all made of Workes. Wherfore of necessity we must understand them both in the same sense. And so the conclusion followes directly. That euery man is iustified by an active not an idle faith , because the Scripture witnesseth that *Abraham* was iustified by the like faith. Our aduersaries collection then from this place. *[That faith and workes*

be compartners in iustification, wee are iustified partly by faith, partly by workes] is vaine & inconsequent. For when the Apostle saies, *A man is iustified by workes & not by faith only*, his meaning is not, that workes and faith are two co-ordinate causes by their ioint-force working our iustification; but the Apostle vtterly excludes faith only from iustification, and attributes it wholly vnto workes. For by *his w^or^ors Faith only*, he vnderstands faith alone, that faith which is *and i^s w^or^orl^w*, v. 17. alone, solitary, by it selfe, without workes. And such a dead faith whereof these *hypocrites* boasted, St James excludes wholly from justifying of a man. *I say then that he is not iustified by faith only: but that he is iustified by workes.* That is a working faith that is fruitfull in Obedience.

E.Example.

The Apostle goes forward from the example of *Abraham* vnto that of *Rahab*, verse 25. *Likewise was not Rahab the Harlot iustified by workes?* That is in the same manner as *Abraham*: so also *Rahab* was iustified by a working faith. Which appeared to be so by that which she did *when shee receaued the messengers*, entertained the two spies which were sent to search the land, lodged them in her house without discouering them. And when by accident they were made knowne, hid them secretly vpon the roose, and afterwards *sent them out another way*, conveied them away priuily, not by the vsuall, but by another way (that is) through the window letting them downe ouer the *wall by a cord*, as the story hath it. *10f. 2.* In this dangerous enterprise, wherein this weake woman ventured her life in succouring the enmities of her *King and Country*: it appeares plainly that she had a strong and liuely faith in the *God of Israel*: & that the confession which shee made with her mouth to the *spies* [*The Lord your God, he is the God in Heaven above and in*

in the earth beneath. Iosb. 2. 11.] proceeded from a truly belieuing heart, in somuch as her words were made good by workes, that followed them. Wherefore the Apostle iustly parallels these two examples of *Abraham* offering his sonne; and *Rahab* in the kinde vslage of the *Spies*, because both those facts were singular trialls of a liuely faith which was able in that sort to ouercome what was hardest to bee conquered. viz. Naturall affection. In *Abraham* both fatherly affection to the life of a deere and only sonne: and in *Rahab* the naturall loue to ones country and a mans owne life did all stoope and giue way, when once true faith commands obedience. Here againe our aduersaries trouble themselues, and the Text with needlessse *speculations* telling vs, that now the *Apostle* hath altered his cliffe, and is gone from the second iustification in *Abrahams* example, to the first iustification in this of *Rahab*. That *Rahab* was conuerted at this time of receiuing the *spies* being made a belieuer of an infidell, a good woman of a bad. That shee by this good worke did expiate her former sinnes and merited the grace and fauour of God, notwithstanding that shee committed a *veniall sinne* in handling of the busynesse, telling a downe-right lye, which though shee should not haue done; yet it hindred not the meritoriousnesse of the worke, with such other fond imáginations peruerting the simplicity of the truth. But first they are not agreed among themselues whether the *Apostle* doe in that sort shift from one *Iustification* to another. *Bellarmino* affirmes it and many moe. But others deny it, as may be seene in *Lorinus* his exposition of the 21.y. of this *Chapter*. And were they agreed vpon it, sure I am they should disagree from the *Apostle*, who makes this second instance of the same nature with the former. *Opolus.* In like manner saith he, was *Rahab* iustified: *vix as Abraham*

was. Againe when they say *Rahab* became a true beleiuera
that time of receiuing the *spies*, not before, 'tis more then
they can proue. By the circumstances of the story it appears
plainely, that she beleueu before they came, by the relati-
on of the great workes which God had done for his *people*,
and the promises that were made vnto them, that they
should possesse *Rahabs* countrey. This bred feare in others:
but faith in her, by the secret working of the *holy Ghost*: See
Joshua 2.9. &c. And certaintly, (had shee not had *Faith*,
before the *spies* came, who can thinke she would haue giuen
entertainment to such dangerous persons? But shee knewe
them to bee the seruants of the God of *Israel* in whom shee
believed; and therefore by this ^afaith shee receaued them
peaceably; though Enimies of her countrey. Lastly to
that of the *Meritoriousnesse* of the worke of *Rahab*, to de-
serue *Grace* and *Life eternall*; we reiect it, not only as a vaine
but an impious conceit, which never entred into the hum-
ble hearts of the Saints of old: but hath beene set on foot in
the last corrupt ages of the world by Men drunken with
selfe loue, and admiration of their owne *Righteousnesse*.

Thus we haue these two examples whereby the *Apostle*
hath proued sufficiently, that the faith which is separated
frō obedience, will not iustifie a man, & therefore that it is a
dead faith, and not a true liuing faith according as was pro-
posed, v.20. Now for a close of this whole dispute he againe
repeats that conclusion, adding thereto a new similitude to
illustrate it by in the last verse of the chapter. *For as the bo-*
dy without the spirit is dead, so faith without workes is dead,
that is, As the body without the spirit. i.e. the Soule, or the
Breath and other Motion (is dead) vnable to performe any
liuing action whatsoeuer: So faith without workes is dead;
that is, vterly vnable to performe these liuing actions, which
belong

belong vnto it. What are those? Two. 1. To repose it stedfastly vpon the promise of life in *Christ*, which is the proper immediate liuing Action of faith. 2. To iustifie a Man in the sight of God, which by a speciall priuiledge is the consequent of the former. These liuing actions cannot be performed by that *Faith* which is dead, being destitute of good works. That *faith* which hath not power to bring forth obedience, is thereby declared to be a dead faith, deuoide of all power to embrace the promise with confidence & reliance as also to iustifie. A man would thinke this were plaine enough, & needed not to be troubled with any further Cavillations. But 'tis strange what a coile our aduersaries make with this similitude, writhing and straining it to such conclusions as the *Apostle* neuer intended. Hence they gather:

1. That as the soule giues life to the body, as the forme of the body: so workes giue life to *Faith*, as the forme of it.
2. That as the body is the same true Body without the soule and with it: so *Faith* is one and the same true faith without workes and with them, which are nothing but *sophisticall speculations* besides the purpose of the text. The *Apostle* intends nothing but to shew the necessity of the *Copulation* of a living faith and obedience together: by the similitude of the like necessity of the vniion of a liuing body, and the Soule. But his purpose is not to shew, that the manner of their *Connexion* is the same, that iust in every point as the soule is to the Body, or the body to the Soule: so workes are vnto faith, and faith vnto workes. It sufficeth to his intent, that as in the absence of the soule, the body: so in the absence of obedience, faith is dead. But thence it followes not, that workes by their presence doe the same thing to *Faith*; as the Soule to the body by its presence; or that faith in the absence of workes remaines the same; as the body

doth in the absence of the soule. If wee must needs bee tied to the strict termes of the Similitude: let vs a little examine the comparison, and we shall see our aduersaries all fly off first from it. Let the comparison be first thus. Betweene the Body and the soule, Faith and Workes as the termes bee in the Text.

As the Body without the soule is dead: because the soule giveth life, i.e. sense, breathing, and all other motion to the body.

So faith without workes is dead, because workes give life unto faith.

But now this comparison will not runne on all four. For Workes are not vnto Faith as the Soule is to the body; but as sense and motion is to the body. Seeing Workes are externall acts, not internall habits: and so are proportionable not to the soule, but to the living actions thence issuing. Wherefore 'tis as absurd to say, that workes giue life vnto faith, as 'tis ridiculous to affirme, that Sense and Motion giue life to the body, which are not causes; but effects and signes of life. Therefore when faith without workes is dead, 'tis not spoken in that sense, because workes giue life to Faith, as the Soule doth to the Body. Let then the comparison bee thus. Betwene the body and the Soule. Faith and Charity.

As the body without the soule is dead, because the soule is the forme of the body, and gives life to it.

So faith without Charity is dead, because Charity is the forme of Faith, and gives life to it.

But neither will the comparison hold vpon these termes, For i. our Aduersaries here put in Charity the habit, for workes the act: which is more then themselues ought to doe, seeing they will tie vs at short bits, to the very letter of the Text. For though we can bee content to admit that inter-

interpretation, would they admit of the *Apostles* plaine meaning, and not straine for *querkes*: yet seeing they argue so precisely from the words of the comparison, they must not now haue liberty from vs to goe from them, but bee content to take the words as they lie in the text; and make their best of them. Yet seeing 'tis most senselesse to make Workes (that is) externall Actions the forme of faith an internall habit: let them take *Charity* instead of them, an internall habit likewise. Will it be any better now? belike so. Then 'tis thus. *As the soule is the forme of the body: so charity is the forme of faith, and as the soule giues life and action to the body, so charity vnto Faith.* Will they stand to this? No. Here againe they fly off in both Comparisons. Charity is one habit, Faith another distinct betweene themselues, and therefore they deny, as there's good reason, that *Charity* is either the *Essentiall forme* of faith, as the soule of the liuing body: or the *accidentall forme*, as whitnesse of *Paper*. They say 'tis only an *externall forme*. But this now is not to keepe close to the *Apostles* comparison, but to runne from it at their pleasure, when they fall vpon an absurdity in pressing of it so strietly. *The Soule is no externall, but an internall Essentiall Forme, and therefore Charity must be so, if all runne round.* Againe doth *Charitie* giue life or liuing actions vnto faith as the soule doth vnto the Body? Neither dare they hold close to this comparison. For the proper worke or action of faith is to assent vnto the truth of divine revelations, because of Gods authority as themselues teach. Whence now comes this assent? From the *Habit of Faith*, or of *Charity*? They grant that it comes immediatlie from the *Habit of Faith*, which produceth this action, euen when its seuered from *Charity*. Then 'tis plaine that it is not *Charity* that giues life to faith, which can performe the proper

per action that belongs to it, without its helpe. How then doth *Charity* giue life vnto *Faith*? For this, they haue a silly conceit. *Charity gives life*, that is *Merite vnto Faith*. The beleefe, or assent vnto diuine truth is *meritorious* if it be with *Charity*. If without, then 'tis not meritorious. This is a faine toy, wherein againe they runne quite from the *comparision* of the *Apostle*. For the *Soule* giues liuing actions to the *Body*, not only the *qualifications* of the actions: and so *Charity* is not like the *soule*, because it giues only the *qualification* of *Merit* vnto the action of *Faith*, and not the action it selfe. Beside. A most vaine interpretation it is, without any ground from Scripture, to say a liuing faith, (that is) *a meritorious faith*: when euē in common sense, the life of any habit consists onely in a power to produce those actions, that naturallie and immediatlie depend vpon that *Habit*. And what Reason is there in the world why the *Habit* of *Charity* should make the actions of *Faith* *meritorious*, or why *Charity* should make *Faith* *meritorious*, rather then *Faith* make *Charity* *meritorious*, seing in this life there is no such *præeminity* of *Charity* aboue *Faith*? Wherefore wee despise these *Speculative sophismes*, which with much faire glozing, our aduersaries draw from the text: but yet when all comes to the triall, themselues will not stand to the strict application of the *similitude*, because it breeds absurdities, which euē themselues abhorre. Now if they take liberty to *qualifie* and *interpret*, they must giue vs leaue to doe so too, or if they will not wee shall take it. To shut vp all. Their other collection is as weake as the former: namely. *A dead body is a true body, ergo a dead faith is true faith*. This argument forceth the *Similitude*, and so is of a force. In materiall things which haue a diuerse being from different *Causes*, it may hold. But 'tis not so in vertues
and

and Graces, Truth and life are both *essentiall* to such qualities. True *Charity* is a liuing *Charity* (i. e.) active, as the *Apostle* himselfe pro ues. verl. 15. True Valour, and so of euery vertuous quality, if it be true, 'tis liuing and stirring in action: if it be otherwise, 'tis counterfeit, some other thing that hath only a shadow of it. All these tricks are put vpon the *Apostle* to peruert his plaine meaning: viz. That as it is necessary to the being of a liuing body that it bee coupled with the soule, so 'tis necessary to the being of a liuing true Christian *Faith*, that it bring forth *Workes of Obedience*.

SECT. 7. CHAP. I.

None can be iustified by their owne satisfaction for the transgression of the Law. A briefe summe of Popish doctrine; concerning humane satisfactions for sinne.

 Hus wee haue a resolution of the dispute of S. James, together with such Cauils, as our Aduersaries make vpon the feuerall passages thereof. By the whole order whereof it appeares sufficiently that S. James disputing against *Faith*, meanes there-by that false and bastard faith which *Hypocrites* pleased them selues withall instead of a true faith: and that disputing for *workes*, he meanes nothing but a working *Faith*. And it appeares also that the drift of the *Apostle* is not in this place to dispute directly of mans *Justification*: but only to bring that in, as an argument to proue his principall Conclusion. *That faith without workes is dead, because it will not iustifie*. In some it's evident, that neither these *Apostles* doe disagree betweene them selues, nor yet either of them doe agree with our aduersaries in teaching *Justification* by

the Workes of the Morall law. Of the impossibility of mans Iustification by which meanes, *Hitherto*.

a Conclusion proued. The next *Proposition* is, that [None can bee iustified by their owne satisfaction for the transgression of the Law.] For this is the only way left for an offender to obtaine *iustification* and *Absolution*: viz: to alleudge that he hath satisfied for his offence committed; by doing or suffering so much as the party offended could in iustice exact of him. Which satisfaction being made, he is no longer debter vnto him, but deserues his *absolution* and his fauour, as if hee had not offended at all. Now then the *Question* is. Whether a sinner may, by any thing done, or endured by himselfe, satisfie the iustice of God, and so obtaine *absolution* at the barre of Gods judgement. Wee defend the negatiue. That it is impossible for a sinner, by any Action or passion of his owne to doe so much as shall be equiualent vnto the wrong which hee hath done vnto the glorious iustice of God: that therewith he may rest satisfied and exact no farther penalty. Which point is so evident vnto the Conscience of every one that knowes himselfe to be, either a *Creature*, or a *Man*, or a *Sinner*; that it needs not any confirmation. If wee be considered as *Creatures*, ther's nothing that a finite strength in a finite time can performe, which can hold proportion with the offence of an infinite goodnesse and iustice, and the eternall punishment thereby deserued. Consider vs as men, so we are bound to fulfill the Law of God in all perfection, nor is there any thing so true, so honest, so iust, so pure, so worthy loue and good report: but the Law one way or other obliges vs vnto the thought and practise of it. So that besides our due debt of obedience, wee haue nothing to spare ouer and aboue, whereby to satisfie God for those Trespasses that wee haue committed vpon his honour and iustice

Phil. 4. 8.
Deut. 5. 6.

iufice. Lastly consider vs as *Sinners*, ſo wee are tyed in a double obligation, 1 of punishment to be ſuffered for *finne* committed. 2. Another of obedience to bee perpetually performed. Both theſe debts of punishment and obedience, are equally exacted of ſinfull men, and ergo 'tis as absurd in diuinity to ſay, the obedience of the law or good workeſ will ſatisfie for the transgression of the law: as 'tis in ciuill dealing to accoumpt the payment of one band the discharge also of another. Wherefore every one that is not blinde & proud in heart will here be ſoone perwaded to relinquiſh all claime of heauen by his owne ſatisfaction, running vnto him only, who alone without the helpe of man or *Angell* hath trodden the winepreſſe of the fiercenesse of Gods wrath, bearing our finnes in his body on the tree, ſuffering the ver-
most, whatſoever was due to the pañiſhment of them. Our aduersaries in this buſineſſe are at a ſtatid, miſtrusting their owne, yet not daring wholy to truſt to *Christs* ſatiſfaction. They will giue him leauē to haue his part, but, by his leauē, they will haue one ſhare too iiii ſatisfying for finnes. For they are a generation of men that are reſolute to be as little beholding to God, as may be, for grace, or for glory. And if there be any article of religion wherein scripture and Reaſon would giue the honour of all vnto God, they looke at it with an euill eye, and caſt about which way to thrust in themſelues for copartners. 'Tis ſtrange to ſee to what paſſe Pride and couetouerneſſe haue brought the doctrine of Sa-
tiſfaction, as it is now taught and practiſed in the *Romifh Church*. With your patience I ſhall take a ſhort ſuruacie of it, that you may ſee whether of vs twaine reſt our conſciences vpon the ſurer and more ſtedfaſt anchor: wee that truſt only to *Christs* ſatiſfaction; or they that ioin their owne together with his.

The ſumme of their doctrine, as it is delivered vnto vs by the Councell of Trent. Sess. 6. cap. 14. 16. & Sess. 14. cap. 8. 9. with the Romiſh Catechisme part. 2. chap. 5. queſt. 52. & ſeq. and explained at large by Bellarmine in his two bookeſ De Purgatorio in hiſ 4th bookeſ De Penitentia, and hiſ bookeſ De Indulgentiis: is this. Sinnes are of two forteſ.

- 1 Sinne committed before Baptiſme: as Originall Sinne in all that are baptiſed infants: and actuall sinneſ in those that are baptiſed as yeareſ of diſcretion.
- 2 Sinne committed after baptiſme: when after the grace of the holy Ghost received in Baptiſme: men fall into ſin, polluting the Temple of God, and grieuing his ſpiriſ.

Touching the former forteſ of Sinneſ, they are agreed that men are freed from them both the fault and punishment, by the meriſ and ſatiſfaction of Christ only, without any ſatiſfaction on our parte. But now for ſinneſ after Baptiſme, in the obtaining of Remiſſion of them, Christ & we parteſakes. Which copartnership is declared vnto vs in thiſ manner. In thiſe ſinneſ (wee muſt know) there are three thiſgs condeſtaſle.

1 The fault in the offence of Gods Maieſty, and violatiōn of our friendſhip with him. Here they grant also, that man cannot ſatiſtie for the fault, doing any thiſg that may appeaſe Gods diſpleaſure, and procure his loue. Christ only hath done thiſ for vs, for whose only ſatiſfaction, God of hiſ mercey freely returnes into fauour and friendſhip with vs. But thiſ muſt be underſtood in a Catholiue ſenſe, viz: for fault of Mortall ſinneſ; as for Veniall ſinneſ God is but ſleightly angry with them, and ſo wee may ſatiſtie him for fault thereof, both in thiſ life, and in Purgatory.

2 The ſtaine or corruption of ſinne, called the reliques of Sin abiding in the ſoule. For the purging out of which, there

there is great force in such satisfactions, as are made by Prayers, Fastings, Almesdeeds, and other laborious workes, although the Heretiques say otherwise. That the abolishing of inherent corruption is by the gift of grace freely bestowed on vs by degrees, in the vse of all godly meanes.

3 The punishment of sinne, which after the fault is pardoned, remaines yet to be suffered. For although it bee true that God in some cases doth pardon both fault and punishment wholly, as in case of Martyrdome, which sweeps all cleane, and makes all reckonings even, and although God might, if it had so pleased him, alwaies for Christ's sake have pardoned the whole debt: yet Holy Mother Church hath determined, that hee doth not so vse to doe. But after that in mercy hee hath forgiuen the fault: yet there's an after reckoning, and wee must come to coram for that punishment, by which his iustice is to receave satisfaction. But (yee must knowe) the punishment of sinnes is twofold.

1 Eternal, is the destruction of soule & body in Hell fire to endure for euer.

Heere now Christ's satisfaction: comes in againe. By whose merits alone they grant, wee are delivered from the eternity of the punishment of sinne. Which must be noted; that Christ's satisfaction hath not eased vs of the substance of the punishment it selfe: but only in the continuance of it.

2 Temporall, to endure only for a time, whereof there are also two degrees.

1 One in this life, as namely all calamities and afflictions upon the Body, Soule, Name, Goods, &c. together with death the last and greatest of euills. All which are inflicted upon man, as punishments of sinne. ¶

thele some come vpon vs ineuitably, as death vpon all men, or as death in the wildernesse on the children of Israel, with the like punishments, certainely & irreuocably denounced. Now here's no remedy but patience, and that's an excellent remedy too. For (as the ghostly Fathers of Trent informe vs) *If they be borne willingly with patience, they be satisfactions for sinnes: but if unwillingly, they bee God's iust revenge upon vs.* Other some come, *Enitabli.* And here such a course may be taken, *that wee need not suffer the punishment it selfe: but we may buy it out and make satisfaction for it vnto God by other meanes.* Which meanes are principally fourre.

- 1 *By the vehemency of contrition, or inward sorrowe. which may be so intensive as to satisfie for all punishments, both in this life and also in Purgatory.*
- 2 *By other outward laborious workes. whereby we may buy out the obligation to temporall punishments. Such workes are these.*

I. *Prayer with confession, Thanksgiving, &c.* For, if we beleue the Catholique Doctors 'tis a very good satisfaction to a Creditour, if the debtor pray vnto him for the forgiuenesse of his debt. According to that Text. Psalme 50.15: *Call upon mee in the day of trouble, and I will deliuer thee.* Ergo, *Prayer is a satisfaction for the punishment of sinne.*

- 2 *Fasting, under which is comprehended the sprinkling of Ashes, wearing of haire cloth, whippings, going bare foot, and such other penall workes.* These also satisfie for sinnes as 'tis written 2.Sam.12. *David fasted, lay upon the ground and wept all night.* Therefore he satisfied for his sinnes of murther and adultery. And againe, *Paul saith, 1.Cor.9.27. I beat downe my body.* That is, *I whip and cudgell my selfe to satisfie*

tisifie for my sinnes. And againe, *Luke, 18.13. The Publican smote upon his breast, Ergo. corporall chastisement is a good satisfaction for sinnes.*

3. *Almesdeeds: comprehending all kinde whatsoeuer workes of mercy.* These also buy out the punishments of sinne according to the Text, *Dan.4.24. Breake off thy sinne by righteousness, and thine iniquity by mercy towards the poore.* That is, By *Almesdeeds* satisfie for the temporall punishments of thy sinnes. And againe, *Luke 11.41. Give almes of that which you haue, and behold all things shall be cleane unto you.* That is to say (in the language of Babell) The temporall punishment of sinne shal bee taken away. Now all such workes as these are either.

1. *Voluntarily undertaken of our owne accord, as voluntary Pilgrimage, Scourgings, Fastes, Sackcloth, Weepings and Prayers of such a number and measure, with the like rough punishments, which wee take upon our selues to pacifie God.* All which being done with an intent to satisfie for the punishment of our sinnes; must needs bee accepted of God Almighty for good payment: because in so doing, wee doe more then hee hath required of our hands.

Now 'tis very pleasing to God to doe what hee bids vs not: or what he bids vs, to doe to another end of our devising. Hee therefore that voluntarily vndertakes such needless paines, giues God high satisfaction. According to the Text, *1.Cor.11.31. If we would judge our selues, we should not be iudged.*

2. *Inioyned by the Priest.* Who by vertue of the Keys committed unto him might iudicallly absollue the penitent from the whole debt, were it not thought fit vpon speciaall considerations to keepe back a part. Wherfore when hee hath

hath absolved him from the fault and eternall punishment, he bindes him vnto satisfaction for the temporall punishment and therefore he enioynes him what bee shall doe to buy it out. Let him goe visit the shrine of such and such a Saint, say so many *Aues* and *Paternosters* before such an Image, whip himselfe so many times, fast so many daies, give so much almes with such like penalties. And when he in humble obedience hath done these things commanded by the *Priest*: then 'tis certaine his sinnes be satisfied for. For 'tis to be noted that in enioyning this *Canonicall satisfaction*, as 'tis called, the *Priest* and *God Almighty* be iust of the same minde. Looke how much the *Priest* enioynes for *satisfaction*. *God* must be content to take the same, or else the *penitent's* conscience will not be quiet, because it may bee, *God* expected more to be done for *satisfaction*: then the party hath done by the *Priest's* iunction. But it is to bee supposed, that as the *Pope*, so every *Priest* in his *Chaire of confession*, hath an infallible spirit, whereby hee is able exactly to calculate the iust proportion betweene the sinne and the punishment, & the price of the punishment, that so he may enioyne iust so much pittance, as will buy it out; neither more lest the penitent be wronged: nor lesse, lest *God* be not satisfied. All which is trimly founded vpon that Text which saith. *whatsoeuer yee binde on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoeuer yee loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* Mat. 16. 19. and 18. 18. That is, *Priests* may forgive the fault and retaine the punishment, and what satisfaction they enioyne on earth to expiate the punishment, that will *God* accept in heaven. Or else they be deceaued. This is the second meanes to satisfie for temporall punishments.

The 3. Meanes is by *Pardons and Indulgences*. Wherein the superabundant merits of Christ and the Saints are out

out of the treasury of the Church graunted by speciall grace of the Bp. of Rome unto such as are liable to suffer the temporall punishment of their sinnes. So that they hauing got by his grant a sufficient portion offatisfactory workes, out of the common stocke, they are freed thereby from satisfying Gods iustice, by their own workes. Which is a rare priuiledge no doubt.

4. *The fourth meanes is by another living mans satisfacion for them.* For not only the superabundant workes of Christ and Saints departed: but the good workes of just men alue will satisfie for another, being done with that intent. So great is Gods clemency towards good Catholiques, that, though one man cannot confess, nor be contrite for another, yet satisfie he may the *Injustice* of God for his *sinnes*. Both these meanes are grounded vpon pregnant places of Scripture. Gal.6.2. *Beare yee one anothers burthen*, that is, satisfie one for another. Againe 2 Cor. 12.15. *I will most gladly beslowe and be bestowed for your sake*: that is, to satisfie for your sinnes. Againe. 2. Tim.2.10. *Suffer all things for the Elects sake*: that is, that my sufferings may be their satisfactions. So Col.1.24. *I rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fulfill the rest of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh, for his bodies sake, which is the Church.* That is. *My sufferings with Christ's sufferings make up a treasure for the Church, that such as want of their owne, may make use of his satisfaction and mine.* Againe Rom.12.15. *Wee being many are one anothers Members.* Ergo, *Wee may impart satisfactory workes one to another, as one member doth heat to another.* To conclude. 'Tis in our Creed. *I beleue a communion of Saints.* Ergo *There is a communion of satisfactions.* And so the point is very fitly proued. Whereby it appeares that the *Children of the Romish Church* are reasonable well prouided of

meanes to recompence Gods Inſtice, and redeeme the Temporall punishment of their ſinnes in this life.

The other degree of the temporall punishment is in the *life to come*, namely, in purgatory, whereinto all they drop who die in *Venial Sinne*, the fault whereof was not forgiuen in this Life; or in *Mortall Sinnes*, the fault whereof was forgiuen in this life; but full ſatisfaction was not made for the punishment before death. Such muſt ſry a while in Purgatory longer or shorter time according as their Sinnes are more or leſſe haynous; or as mens hearts on earth bee more or leſſe pittifull towards them. But howeuer there they muſt be till the Temporall punishment of their Sinnes be fully ſuffered: or bought out by ſomething else that may ſatisfie Gods inſtice.

This Punishment of ſinne inflicted in Purgatory, is twofold.

1 *Pena Damni. of Loſſe* (viz.) of the beautifull viſions of God, and ioyes of Heaven.

2 *Pena ſenſuſ. of conſe or ſmārt. viz.* The bitter paines of God's wrath ſenſitely tormenting the Powers of the Soule, inflicted upon them either immediately by God himſelfe, or by the miniftry of the diuels as his Instruments.

For 'tis a doute not yet resolued among the Patrons of Purgatory, whether the Diuell's haue nor to doe there alſo as well as in hell. But whether their tormentors bee diuels or not, this is agreed vpon, that the torment and punishment which the ſoules doe ſuffer in Purgatory, is for the ſubſtance of it the very ſame with the torments of Hell, differing onely from it in continuance, thoſe of Purgatory be temporall, theſe of Hell eternall. Well now, ſuch as haue not beſtirred themſelues then well in this life to make all euen by full ſatisfactions, ſuch muſt be arrested in the mid way to Heaven, and

and cast into this Prison. Out of which two meanes there
be to be deliuered.

1 *By ſuffering all this temporall punishment for ſo many
yeares and dayes as tis to continue.* How many, that is, you
mauſt inquire of St Michael, the Church knowes not that.
But yet ſure ſhe is, that many Soules ſhall continue in Puri-
gatory till the day of Indgement, ſo there ſhall be the ſame
period of the world, and of their torments. These haue a
hard time of it; 'tis easier happily with others. But be it as
'twill be, ſuch as theſe pay the vymote farthing, where they
endure in the flames of Purgatory, ſo long till the time of
their whole punishment be runne out. Then God is ſatisfied
and they deliuered.

2 *By laying out this punishment by ſome other ſatisfactory
price.* For althoſh God could ſo haue ordered it, that
every Soule being once in purgatory, ſhould ſuffer all the
Temporall punishments due: yet he is content to bee in-
terested to committe penance, and take ſome other valueable
consideration by way of ſatisfaction for this punishment.
But this ſatisfactory payment cannot be made by the loules
themſelues: it muſt bee made by ſome on earth for them:
which is done. 1 Either by laborious workeſ of any one
iust and godly Catholique, whether he be a friend of the Ge-
ceſed, or other touched with a charitable pitty toward a
poore soule. Who by ſtore of devout prayers, Almes, Maſ-
ſes, Pilgrimages, founding of Couents and Hospitals, &c.
may procure a gaole-delivery for that soule for which hee
intends thoſe good workeſ. 2 Or by the Pope who is purſ-
bearer to the Church, and hath the treaurie thereof vnder
locke and key. He now, though he cannot direcely abſolute
the ſoules in Purgatory from their punishment, as he can
men living on the earth, yet hee may helpe them another

way by bestowing on them so much of the superfluous sufferings of Christ & of the Saints, that thereby Gods Justice may bee satisfied, for the whole punishment, which otherwise they shoulde haue endured. Yea such is the power of his *Indulgences* to infuse a vertue into such and such Altars, Shrines, Praiers, &c. that whosoeuer shall frequent such places or vse such prayers, all complements duly obserued: he may at his pleasure free 1. 2. 3. or more soules out of *Purgatory*. Nay did not ~~not~~ *quietenes* coole the heat of his *Apostolical Charity*, he might so bountifullly powre out the Treasures of the Church vpon these Prisoners in *Purgatory*, that they should all haue enough to weigh downe the scales, and deserue a *passe-port* for *Heaven*. Such efficacie there is in that *Spirituall pick-locke* which the Pope hath in keeping. All which is very properly proued by the former places of Scripture, and others also, were it needfull now to alleadge them. But thus we see the *Catholiques* are every way furnished for *satisfactions*: that what Christ hath no done for them, they can doe for themselves, either to suffer and ouercome the *Temporall punishments* of their Sinnen, or else, which is the easier course, to buy out that punishment at a valuable price of other *satisfactionary* workes, wherewith Gods justice shall be abundantly contented. Now whereas those whom they terme *Heresiques*, cry our-aloud that such *satisfactions* to God's justice bee indeed no *Satisfactions* at all, because they are no waies equall vnto the *offense committed*: and so no full recompence of wrong offered vnto God: for the assailing of this d:ubt, they giue vs this distinction very necessary to be obserued. Satisfaction is double.

I. *Infirmitate ex rigore Iustitiae ad absolutam & perfectam Aequalitatem Quantitatis*. That is, There is a satisfaction of Justice consisting in a perfect equality betweene the

the offence and wrong, and the recompence made; when so much is done, or suffered, as the offended party can in justice exact. Now they grant that man cannot satisfie God in this sort in rigour of Justice. Only Christ hath satisfied so; for unto such a satisfaction it is required that it be done.

1. *Ex proprijs. By that which is our owne.*
 2. *Ex indebitis. By that which is not debt of it selfe.*
 3. *Ad equalitatem. By that which is of equall worth and value.* Now none of these waies can our satisfaction passe in strict justice. Because whatsoever wee haue, 'tis Gods free gift: whatsoever wee can doe, 'tis our due obedience, and when we haue done all, yet wee cannot by any finite act doe such honour to God, as shall bee equall to that iniury wee haue offered to his infinite Majestie. Even the right of Nature teacheth, as Bellarmine grants, that man cannot *paria reddere Deo*; give him *quid pro quo*.
2. *Acceptationis factus ex gratia donante ad imperfectionem. Aequalitatem proportionis & ex condigno, i. e. There is a satisfaction of favourable acceptance, wherein there is a kinde of imperfect proportion betweene the offence and the recompence; when so much is done or suffered, as God is content in gentleness to take for gods satisfacion.* Thus then a man may satisfie Gods justice, because God gives him grace to doe so much as hee will accept for satisfaction. Which Grace is threefold:

1. *The Grace of Justification, whereby the holy Ghost dwels in vs, and wee are made members of Christ, and Christ is become our Head. By means of which union with Christ, and inhabitation of the Spirit, it comes to passe that our works have a singular vertue. For Christ communicates unto vs his satisfaction, and by merits of them.*

them, makes our workes meritorious and satisfactorie unto God.

So that whereas all things whatsoever wee could haue done, were of no worth at all in the sight of God: now Christ hath deserued such a grace for vs that the spotted ragges of our righteousnesse and good workes being *mixta Christi sanguine* (i.e.) died in the bloud of Christ receauing such a colour, that they will passe for reasonable good cloth. In a word, our money is now good siluer which before was but brasse. Againe, because the *holy Ghost* dwells in the iust, Ergo (as Bellarmine profoundly argues) their workes proceeding from the *holy Ghost* have [*quandam infinitatem*] a kind of infiniteness in them, and thereby, *quandam equalitatem*, a kinde of equality with the iniury which by sinning we offered unto God. Euen as a man may say, that a Fly or a Spider is a kinde of infinite creature because it is of Gods making: & God yee knowe is infinite. This is the first Grace of *Justification*. The second yee may call,

2. *The Grace of Evangelical Counsailes*. For although God might of right challenge all our workes as due vnto him: yet so it is that he commands not all, but only perswads and exhortes vnto some. By which bounty of God, it comes to passe that wee haue certaine workes *Propria & indebita*, of our owne which we owe him not, and by these we only make satisfaction. Yea such is the bounty of God, that he suffers vs to merit by those things which be of his free gift, and is willingly content that what we receive at his hand, we give it him backe againe for a satisfactory payment to his justice. Which is very strange I tell you.

3. *Lastly one grace more God gives vs*. Namely, when he pardons the faults he removes the eternallity of the punishment, and makes it temporall, that so it may be more easilly

sily ſatisfied for. All which particulars and *Privileges* are ſure and certaine, because the *Catholique Doctoires* haue firmly proued them out of their owne Heads without the helpe of the *Scripture*. So then they are agreed. That our workes are not ſatisfactorie in rigour of iuſtice: but only in fauourable acceptance, by grace giuen to doe them, & Gods clemency in accepting them being done.

CHAP. II.

All ſinne is remitted vnto us wholy in the fault and punishment. For the onely ſatisfaction of Iesus Christ.



Hus I haue ſomewhaſt largely ſet forth vnto you the *Popiſh Doctrine* of humane ſatisfaction for ſinne, wherein it is plaſne to all that can ſee any thing, that their aime hath beeene to lay a plot to delude mens ſoules & picke their *Purſes*. It would require a large diſcourſe to prosecute their Arguments, whereby they ſeeke to couer their fraud. But they are not of that moment, aſto ſpend time about them, being to haſten to other matters. The ſumme of them all comes vnto this. 1. That thofe afflictions and temporall chafteſments which God hath laid vpon his Children (for the Triall of their faith and patience, for their humilia‐tion for ſinnes past by hearty repentaunce, for their admonition for the time to come, for the example of others. &c.) they muſt needs bee, in theſe mens Imaginations, true ſatisfactions to Gods Iuſtice to expiate their ſinnes past. 2. That ſuch good workes as the godly haue performed for declaration of their piety, teſtification of their thankfulneſſe vnto God, ſo to expreſſe the ſorrow of heaſets, for to bring them

selues to a greater measure of true humiliation by much *Prayer, Fasting, &c.* for to obtaine victory ouer some corruption, and temptation, for to get some grace which they wanted; for to preuent or fit themselues for some iudgement feared; &c. All this now must be conceiued presently to be meritorious and satisfactorie to Gods iustice for Sin.

3 That such penance, as in the *Primitive Church* was enioyned vnto those that after their *Conversion* and *Baptisme*, relapsed againe to *Heathenisme*; or otherwise for such as for scandalous offences were excommunicated; I say that such Penance enioyned to these for testification of their hearty sorrow for their offence, and for satisfaction to the *Congregation*, before they might be againe admitted into it: must now bee turned into a direct and proper satisfaction for the sinne it selfe.

4 That such indulgence or fauour as was then sometimes vsed toward such relapsed, and excommunicate persons (in remitting vnto them some part of their enioyned Penance vpon euident tokens of their vnfained repentance) this is now by these men turned quite to another vse. Namely, to the freeing of men from further satisfaction to Gods Iustice by applying vnto them certaine *phantasticall supererogations treasured up in the Popes Cabinet*. These are the maine issues and errors of their disputes, wherein I will proceed no farther, but only lay downe one generall conclusion opposite vnto their doctrine, and so end this point with a few reasons for the confirmation of the truth and confutation of this error. The Position is this.

All sinne whatsoeuer, Originall or Actuall is remitted vnto vs wholly in the faults and punishment, as well Temporall as Eternall for the only satisfaction of Jesus Christ; & not any satisfaction made by vs vnto the iustice of God.

For

For confirmation of this sacred truth deliuered vnto vs in the word and generally embraced by the *Reformed Churches* (yea by our aduersaries themselues when the *Agonies of Conscience, the apprehension of Death & Gods Judgement*) doe cleere vp their eyes, a little to behold the *vanity* of their poore *satisfaction*) obserue wee these Reasons.

First the innumerable testimonies of Scripture ascribing the remission of *Sinne*, only to the *mercy of God in Christ crucified*. *That Christ hath borne^a our sinnes; His blood hath purged^b vs of all sinne; His death^c redeemed vs from all ini-*

^a 1. Pet. 2. 24.^b Heb. 1. 3.^c Tit. 2. 24.

quity; his^d stripes healed vs; that he hath^e paid the ~~avallance~~^f or price of our Ransome; That God for his^g sake hath forgiuen vs our trespasses; Blotted out^h our sinnes; Cast themⁱ behind his backe; Forgotten^j them; with store of the like sayings, ascribing the doeing away of all sinnes to the *Grace of God* through the *Satisfaction of Christ* without limiting it to any Sinne, or mentioning any *satisfactorie workes* of ours. Now what say our aduersaries to this? By a shift they turne of all Scriptures tending to this purpose. Thus *Christ hath satisfied for the fault of our sinnes; and so reconciled vs unto God, and for the eternity of the punishment: but hee satisfied not for temporall punishment: Wee must endure tormentes though but for a while.* This is a meere Cavill without any apparent ground from such texts of Scripture; or necessary deduction from other. Wee deny it therefore as they affirme it. And that it may appeare to be but a forged diuice: Let vs invert the distinction and we shall holde it with as good probability the other way. *Christ satisfied for the fault, not for the punishments* (say they.) Wee will goe contrary and say, *Christ satisfied for the punishment: but not for the fault.* Wee by our owne satisfaction must procure Gods favour. Now let them obiect what they can against this: if wee lust to ca-

^d Isa. 53. 5.^e 1. Pet. 2. 24.^f 1. Tim. 2. 6.^g Col. 2. 13.^h Ibid. v. 14.ⁱ Isa. 38. 7.^j 1 Cor. 31. 34.

b Call. i. 20.

vill as they doe: it may be ſhifted off with as faire probability; as they doe our arguments on the other part. Let them name all the places that ſay, *Christ hath reconciled vs vnto God his father.* This is eaſily put off. *Christ hath reconciled vs.* That is *Christ deserved ſuch grace for vs: that wee by our workes may reconcile our ſelues.* Iuſt as they ſay. *Christ hath ſatisfied, that is: procured grace for vs: that wee by our workes might ſatisfie.* Let them obiect, *Our workes can bee of no worth to appeafe Gods anger.* Wee will ſay. True. Of themſelues they are not, but Christ hath merited that they ſhould be of ſufficient worth. Iuſt as themſelues ſay vnto vs obiecting, that our workes be not of value to ſatisfie Gods Iuſtice. True ſay they. Of themſelues they be not: but *Christ hath deserved for them to make them ſatisfactorious.* Thus if euery idle diſtinction not fortified by neceſſary deduc-
tion from Scripture might paſſe for a good anſwere, the cer-
tainty of Diuine Doctrine were ſoone shaken to pieces:
and no poſition ſo absurd, but would bee defended with
much facility.

a Bell. de pen.
lib. 4. cap. i.

2 That aſſertion of theirs. Namely. *That the fault is forgiuen and the punishment required,* is moſt falſe and ab-
ſurd; euen in common ſenſe. To pardon a fault & be friends
and yet require full ſatisfaction; to forgive the debt, yet to
exact the payment, be not theſe trimme kindneſſes? ^a Bel-
larmino tellſ vs, there be ſome offences of ſo grieuous Na-
ture: that ſatisfaction cannot bee made, but in a long time.
Now in this caſe the party wronged may pardon the other,
& be reconciled to him: yet the offender remaine ſtill bound
to make entire ſatisfaction for the wrong. But now the *In-
ſtitute* doth not name any ſuch caſe: neither indeed can doe.
For ſuppoſe a ſubiect hath offendeth his Prince and the fault
deserued 7 yeares cloſe imprifonment for ſatisfaction. If the

Prince

Prince ſhould ſay vnto him I pardon your offence, you haue my loue; but yet you ſhall lie by it to the laſt daie: were it not a mockerie, would any man thanke him for ſuch a kindneſſe? It is to be thought the *ſejuites*, the incendiaries of Christendome would not thanke Christian princes for ſuch a curteſie, if they ſhould pardon them their fault, and hang them vp. The like abſurditie there is in this, when they ſay; That after the fault pardoned; yet in this life and in *Purgatory*, the temporall punishment muſt be ſuffered. For wherfore muſt it be ſuffered? *For ſatisfaction* ſay they, to what? To Gods Injuſtice. For what now? Is it for the fault and offence committed? No, That's pardoned. For what then? For iuſt nothing.

Againe, this aſſertion is contrary to good reaſon. For God's *Friendſhip*, and his *Injuſtice* may not be diuided in this ſort, as if he were reconciled and well pleased with that creature, which hath violated his iuſtice, and not made ſatisfaction for it. Gods friendſhip with man followes *satisfaction* to his *Injuſtice*: euen as his enmity with man is a confequent of the breach of his iuſtice. His righteous will is tranſgressed, therefore he is offendēd. His righteous will muſt bee ſatisfied before he be pleased. So that it is a vaine ſpeculation to thinke. (*Christ hath appeaſed Gods anger, but not ſatisfied his iuſtice, for asmuch as his fauour is purchased onely by ſatisfaction to his iuſtice offended.*)

3 This doctrine of *humane ſatisfactions*, obſcures the dignity, & ouerthrows the Force of *Christ's ſatisfactions*. If wee haue a ſhare, he hath not all the glory. Nay, hee hath ſcarce any at all. For aske wee. For what hath *Christ* ſatisfied? They ſay, to procure God's Loue to vs. But that can- not be, vnielſe he hath ſatisfied his iuſtice. Hath he done this, or no? Yes, he hath ſatisfied for the *Eternity of the puniſh-*

ment. Yea. But how know they that? What if wee vpon their grounds say, that he hath not satisfied for the eternity of it: but only merited, that our sufferings and satisfactions should be equiualent to the eternity of the punishment? Especially considering that our workes according to *Bellarmino*, haue a certaine kinde of infinite value in them. Againe, eternity is but an accident of punishment of Sinne: the Essentials of it are the losse of ioy, & the sense of paine: if therefore *Christ* haue satisfied only for that, he hath done but the least part. Neuerthelesse our aduersaries will needs perswade vs, that *humane satisfactions* doe not so muche eclipse as illustrate the glory of *Christ's satisfactions*: in as much as thereby hee hath not only satisfied himselfe: but made vs able also to satisfie. A great matter doubtlesse. But where saith the Scripture any such matter, that *Christ* hath merited that wee might merit and satisfie. And moreouer by this tricke, whilte *Christ* makes vs able to merit and satisfie: his owne satisfaction is plainly excluded. For come to the point, and aske. Who is it satisfies God's iustice for Sin? Christ, or wee? Here^b *Bellarmino* stumbles like a blinde horse, and of three answeres takes the very worst. Some say 'tis *Christ*, and he only satisfies properly: but we improperly. Our workes being only a condition without which *Christ's satisfaction* is not applied vnto vs. But such smell of the fagot. For 'tis a perious Heresie to say, *Christ* only satisfies for Sinnen. Well others say, that both *Christ* and wee our selues doe satisfie, and also ther's two satisfactions for the same offence. But this mettall clinketh not well neither. Wherfore others are of opinion, & *Bellarmino* likes it. That we only satisfie, not *Christ*. *Tertius tamen modus probabilior videtur* [Quod vnatantū sit actualis satisfactio, & easit no[n]tra.] Yea this is as it should be, thrust out *Christ*, & let vs only satisfie while

*d Bell. lib. 1. de
Purgat. cap.
14 S. quarta
Ratio.*

while he stands by and holds the Candle. Yet the *Jesuite* will not doe *Iesus* so much wrong: for marke, to mend the matter he addes. [*Neg. tamen excluditur Christus, vel satisfactio eius. Nam per eius satisfactionem habemus gratiam, unde satisfacimus. Et hoc modo nobis dicitur applicari Christi satisfactio; non quod immediatè ipsa eius satisfactio tollat penam temporalem nobis debitam: sed quod mediata eam tollat, quatenus gratiam ab eo habemus, sine qua nihil valeret nostra satisfactio.*] Which words they may understand that can; for I cannot. The *Jesuite* walkes in the darke: seeking to hide this shamefull iniurie to the Merits of Christ, but it will not bee. 'Tis too apparant that Christ is to them of no account: Onely for a fashion they make vse of his Name, when they haue reckoned vp a bdd role of their own Merits, & Saints merits, and such other trash, then to conclude all with a [*Per Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum*] That's the burden of the song, and the oylye that seasons all the Salet: as ² *Marnix* merrily.

4 That distinction of *Satisfaction* in *Strict justice*, and *satisfaction* in favorable *acceptance* is vaine in this businesse. We grant indeed that our good works done out of *Faith* are pleasing to God, and graciously accepted of him: but can it appeare, that God accepts them as *satisfactions* to his *Injustice*? No Scripture intimates any such thing, that God's fauour doth thus dispense with his justice; and make that *satisfaction* acceptable, which is in it selfe no full satisfaction of his *Injustice*. Shall wee thinke that God in this case is put vpon those termes of *Necessity*, and *complement* which fall out in *humane satisfactions*, betweene man and man? It may so fall out that a Creditor (to whom 1000 Crownes are owing) may bee content if the debtor will yeeld vp his whole estate, though not worth 50. Because no more can be

² *Tabula de
differentiis 4.
part. Tom. 2. 6.
15. 16.*

Brill. lib. 4. dc
Penance. cap. I.

had. So in case of offence, sometime, a little formality, or a word or two of confession of the wrong may be accepted for satisfaction. But God wants no meanes to receive full satisfaction of vs, either vpon our owne persons, or vpon *Christ for vs*. And therefore tis without ground to imagine such a facility and partiality of his *Inſtitute*, as to be satisfied with a few poore complementall formalities. Satisfactions to Gods *Inſtitute* we acknowledge none; but such as are in *Inſtitute* ſufficient. Such are *Christs satisfactions*. But as for vs, we haue nothing to doe with ſatisfactions, but with free Pardons.

5 This doctrine of *humane ſatisfactions*, taught in the *Church of Rome* is a' together full of *uncertainty*, and *ergo*, brings no rest and *peace* vnto mens conſciences at all. God pardons the fault: but requires the punishment ſay they. But when is this? Is it alwaies? No, ſometimes he pardons both. But can they tell certainly when he doth? when not? At *Martyrdom* he pardons all. How knowe they that? or how knowe they he doth it not at other times too? *Contriſtione* (ſay they) if it be vehement, ſatisfies for all. But can they tell vs the iuft measure of that *Contriſtione* which is ſatisfactory? It may be the party is contrite enough: yet the *Priest* enioynes *Penance* when tis needless. It may be he is not contrite enough: yet no *penance* enioyned. Where's the certainty, what's to bee done in ſuch a caſe? *Chrift* (ſay they) hath ſatisfied for the *Eternity of Hell punishment*. Well. But can they tell how many yeares or daies are left unsatisfied for; that ſo all things may be fitted according to the race of time? Laborious works, of *Praiers, Fastings, Almes, deeds*, ſatisfie for temporall punishments in this life, (ſay they) Suppose it be ſo. Are they ſure they can also ſatisfie the paines of *Purgatory*? The *Priest* enioynes *satisfactory penance*. But is he ſure he enioynes iuft ſo much as will doe the

the Feat? Is he certaine that God will take that for payment which he decrees to be paid? What if there be not *Ave-Mariæ* enough, &c. Againe, suppose there were *Evangelical Counſailes*, as *Vowes of Chriftiety, Pouerty, &c.* and that to doe these things were pleasing vnto God. Are they ſure they ſhall paſſe for *satisfactions* preſently? Thou ſaifit I giue this *Almes*, I vow *Pouerty*, I doe this and that to ſatisfie Gods Iuſtice for ſuch or ſuch a finne. What? Is it a match preſently, that God muſt doe as thou deſireſt: and take what thou offereſt for payment? Soft there a while. Wheres the warrant for that? Those that are in *Purgatory*, when haue they ſatiſfied enough? Who brings word, when they are deliuered? How knowes the *Pope* when he hath beſtowed vpon them ſufficient ſupererogatiue *Money* to pay the *Fees* of the *Prifon*? Or doth *St Michael* that holds the *Scales* fend him word, when their ſatisfactions weigh down their ſins? Not to reckon more vp; there is in all this doctrine no firme ground whereon a diſtrefſed ſoule may caſt anchor: But when it hath once let ſlip that maine *Cable*, wherupon it might rid it out in all ſtormes (*the ſatisfaction of Christ*) afterwards it is carried a drift vpon all hazards of *Windes & Seas*.

6 Their practife betraies their Opinion. Did they indeed thinke that there were any ſeuerny in Gods iuſtice, any neceſſitie or ſufficiencie in ſuch their ſatisfaction, 'tis not poſſible, they would proſtitute ſuch things in ſo bafe a manner, as they doe. But when an *Ave Maria*, a *Pater noster* before ſuch or ſuch an *Altar*; a *wax Candle* to ſuch a *Saint*; a *keſſe* of ſuch a *cold ſtone*; a *pilgrimage* to *Compoſtella* for *coc-
kle ſuels*; a *laſh* or *twaine* vpon the *Bare*; two or threē *meals meat* for borne; a *parardon* purchased at a few *Deneirs*; yea when the roughneſſe and meaneſſe of *Adams fig-leane breeches*

*ches shall bee accounted a worthy matter to satisfie for his sinne, as a Bellarmine most ridiculous dotes; I say, when such base trifles shall be reckoned to be valuable satisfactions to Gods Justice: they must pardon vs if wee guesse at their meaning. They may dispute and talke while they will in big words and faire glories of Bridles against sinnes, and I knowe not what: but in fine all proues but Ginnes to catch money: But such as serue themselves thus vpon God, & play with his Justice, as the *fise* with the *Candie*; let them take heed, lest in the end, they be consumed by it.*

*De penit. l.4.c.
g. scit. 5. Iren.*

To leauie then these vaine inventions. Let vs give to God the glory that's due to his name: and so wee shall well prouide for the peace of our Soules. Trusting entirely and only vnto that Name of ^b *Iesus Christ. Besides which, there is not in heauen, or in Earth (in Man or Angell) any name, Verit, Power, Satisfaction, or whatsoeuer else, whereby wee may besaued.* And thus much touching the first maine branch of the matter of our Iustification, namely, *Our owne Righteousesse.* Whereby it appeares sufficiently, that wee shall never be iustified in Gods Sight.

b A.B.4. v.12.

M'rym tu' O'z'w d'z'a. FINIS.



12 AN EXPOSITION OF THE

sitting by violence, but according to *Davids* example in all his behaviour towards this wicked King *Saul*, conforming our selves, and according to the rule prescribed unto us in the word of God, *R om. 13.*

17. Last of all, we see how wonderfully the wicked are disappointed of their purposes, this *Amalekite* looked for favour, thanks, and benefit, but by wickednesse and an unjust fact to attaine thereto, especially at the hands of a godly man, was the wrong way, & therefore he is justly rewarded according to his desert, by death, thus Satan ever blindest, & deceives the wicked, like *Laban*, making them to serve for one thing promised, but changing their wages and giving them another thing in performance. You shall be like God, (said he unto *Eve*) but the contrary was found true, and *Pharaoh* thought that he wrought wisely, by burdens and bondage to waste *Israel*, & redact them to a few number, but they increased the more, and when he had essayed all means, he proved the fool notwithstanding, making his Land to be plagued, his first borne slain, and himselfs with his people drowned.

11. Also we see the wicked are the cause of there own perdition, and a guilty conscience snares it self, therefore doth *David* conclude, thy blood be upon thy own head, for thy own mouth hath confessed, &c.

II. S A M. Chap. 1. from the 17. verse to the end.

WE shew in the Preface before the Chapter that the generall subject of this Book is the History of the reign of *David*, begun at the death of *Saul*, while the institution of *Salomon*.

The utiltie declares itself in the particulars, as in the confirmation of faith by the infallible performance of Gods promise to *David*, in the raising of his Kingdome, albeit after great troubles, and in the example of life and manners, as in the patience, piety, righteous government, magnanimity in adversity, prudence in prosperity, and others his vertues, and albeit as man feeble, and subject to infirmities, and falls, yet rising again by true and earnest repentance.

But because *Davids* Kingdome is the type of Christs Kingdome in the comparison we have the chief utility to be remarked, that

SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL. II

by David, wherein as we see the nature of the wicked to be ready to commit villany upon slender motives, so we see that a wicked command upon no pretext ought to be obeyed, neither can it be free from the check of conscience, nor punishment of upright justice, all pretenses being but like Adams figtree leaves, or his naughty excuse of his wifes entisement.

14. The respects of Davids mourning for Saul, Jonathan, and the People, both internall, or spirituall, and externall, or naturall, I mentioned before, onely this is to be observed, that there is a double death to be lamented of Magistrates, the one corporall, as here, the other spirituall, which is the corruption of their manners; and as it is most prejudicall to Church, or Commonwealth, so is it most to be deplored of all, and this made Samuel to go home to Ramah, and lament for Saul, all his dayes, this spirituall death is a sure fore runner oftimes of a fearfull temporall.

I Sam

15. V. 15. We see here the happy beginnings of a godly Kingdome, in the reward of this reporter, consisting in two points. 1. In the rejecting of disimulate Hypocrify, & cunning flattery, whereby this Amalekite had covered his greedy design of reward by counterfeiting the behaviour of those who deplored a publick calamity, by doing humble obseruance to David, by reporting a peece of acceptable service done unto him as he supposed, and by bringing Sauls Crown unto him, 2. In executing upright Justice upon him, who had confessed with his own mouth Ces-majesty, or treason, whereby David doth as he would be done to, and cleareth himself hereby of all desire he had of Sauls death by any indirect means, confirming so his innocency, so frequently before attested to Saul himself, and the integrity of his heart.

16. It is not Lawfull then (we perceive) to any one subject for what cause soever to put violent hands on their Lawfull Prince & supream Magistrate, for if he be evill it is for our sins, therefore returne to God by unsained repentance, and pray for him & then he will either remove, or reform him in his good time, and if he command things unlawfull, let us obey rather God then man, and eschew his unjust wrath so far as we can, but if God call us to suffering, therein let our care be that we suffer not for evil doing, and yeeld patiently and constandy to the Lords calling, never in all this lifting up our hand against the Lords anointed, nor re-



52





